

JPRS-TAC-87-023

3 APRIL 1987

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

3 APRIL 1987

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR's Dobrynin, French Parliamentary Delegation Discuss SDI (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 22 Feb 87).....	1
Soviet Weekly Warns of Danger of SDI Computer Error (Yuri Baturin; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 9, 9 Mar 87).....	3
Canada: U.S. Stand on SDI, ABM Treaty Discussed (Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 6 Mar 87; Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN, various dates).....	9
External Affairs Minister Clark, by Arch MacKenzie	9
OTTAWA CITIZEN 12 February Editorial	10
Disarmament Ambassador Roche, by Ian Hunter	12
OTTAWA CITIZEN 26 February Editorial	14
Canadian Editorial on Gorbachev Attack on SDI at Peace Forum (Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN, 17, 19 Feb 87).....	15
17 February Editorial	15
19 February Editorial	16
Indian Communist Paper on Gorbachev Nuclear-Free Forum Speech (Editorial: New Delhi PATRIOT, 18 Feb 87).....	17

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR Opinion Poll on Nuclear-Free World (Moscow NEW TIMES, No 9, 9 Mar 87).....	19
--	----

Munich Conference Scene of Discord Over U.S.-Soviet Talks (Ernst-Otto Maetzsche; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 3 Feb 87).....	25
Canada: TORONTO STAR on Opportunity for Arms Control Pact (Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 3 Mar 87).....	28
Indian Defense Expert Writes on New U.S. Nuclear Test (C. Raja Mohan; Madras THE HINDU, 11 Feb 87).....	30
INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES	
Soviet Premier Receives Swedish Delegation (Moscow TASS, 6 Mar 87).....	33
UK's Thatcher, Howe Welcome Gorbachev Arms Proposal (Chris Moncrieff; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 2 Mar 87)...	34
Canadian Reaction to Gorbachev Arms Reduction Proposal (Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 3 Mar 87; Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 3, 4 Mar 87).....	36
Clark Remarks	36
TORONTO STAR Article, by Richard Gwyn	37
Disarmament Ambassador Roche, by Ron Lowman	38
Netherlands Government Reacts 'Positively' to Gorbachev Proposal (Van Eekelen; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 2 Mar 87).....	40
Cypriot Government Welcomes Missile Proposal (Nicosia Domestic Service, 5 Mar 87).....	41
Canada: Cruise Missile Testing Draws Reaction (Various sources, various dates).....	42
Environmentalists, Group Coalition	42
Arms Control, Disarmament Center, by Andrew McIntosh	43
Greenpeace, Other Groups, by Dana Flavelle	45
Activities During Test	47
Toronto Rally, by Dana Flavelle	48
Second Test Without Protests	49
Turner on Liberal Stand	50
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
USSR Assails Japan Military's Creation of Chemical Subunits (S. Agofonov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 20 Feb 87).....	51

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

NATO, Warsaw Pact Begin Informal CSCE Disarmament Talks (Paris AFP, 17 Feb 87).....	53
--	----

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow Reports on Visit by Tongan Official, Rarotonga Talks (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Feb 87; Moscow TASS, 20 Feb 87)...	54
Demichev Meeting, Luncheon	54
Meeting With Shevardnadze	55
Norway Sees NATO Doctrine as Hampering Nordic Zone (Olav Trygve Storvik; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 4 Feb 87).....	57
Finnish Official, Newspaper Urge Continuing Testing Halt (Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 8, 13 Feb 87).....	59
Foreign Ministry in Geneva	59
Paper: New Arms Race, Editorial	59
Finnish President Says Country Ready for New Initiatives (Mauno Koivisto; Helsinki UUSI SUOMI, 24 Jan 87).....	61
New Delhi: Palme Commission Calls for Comprehensive Test Ban (Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA, 12 Feb 87).....	62

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA on Shultz PRC Visit: U.S., PRC SDI, NFZ Policies Differ (Ye. Sevastyanov; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Mar 87).....	63
Soviet Foreign Minister Visits Australia (Various sources, 3, 4 Mar 87).....	64
Issues Arrival Statement	64
Hayden Welcomes Shevardnadze	65
Shavardnadze Meets With Hawke	65
Shevardnadze Talks With Hayden	66
Hayden Hosts Luncheon	67
Second Talks 'Difficult,' 'Frank'	67
Shevardnadze: Cut Asia SS-20's to 33	68
No Pacific Military Presence	68
Shevardnadze Dinner Speech	69
Moscow TV Interviews Hayden	71
TASS Reportage on Visit of Italy's Andreotti (Moscow TASS, 27 Feb 87; Rome Domestic Service, 27 Feb 87).....	73
Detailed Talks With Gorbachev	73
Andreotti Luncheon Speech	75
Shevardnadze Addresses Luncheon	76
Rome Radio Interviews Andreotti	76

TASS Reportage on Official Visit of Italy's Fanfani (Moscow TASS, 23, 24 Feb 87; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 25 Feb 87).....	78
Received by Gromyko	78
Meets With Gorbachev	79
Meets Tolkunov, Zagladin	80
Gromyko Receives Swedish Parliamentary Delegation (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 1 Mar 87).....	81
Bombay Analyst Says Challenge Remains After Moscow Meet (K. Subrahmanyam; Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA, 21 Feb 87).	83
Briefs	
Pirzada to Disarmament Conference	85
Mufti Attends Disarmament Conference	85
Mufti Khalid Attends Moscow Conference	85

/12223

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR'S DOBRYNIN, FRENCH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION DISCUSS SDI

PM271103 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Interparliamentary Ties"]

[Excerpts] A delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet Chambers' Foreign Affairs Commissions headed by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commission, met in Moscow 20 February with a French National Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission delegation headed by its Chairman R. Dumas.

The Soviet delegation included V.V. Zagladin, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union Foreign Affairs Commission, and Deputies S.F. Akhromeyev, G.A. Zhukov, V.V. Karpov, L.I. Popov, and S.V. Chervonenko, commission members.

The French delegation included L. Mermaz, chairman of the Franco-Soviet Friendship Group in the National Assembly, and Deputies A. Bellon, G. Bordu, J.-M. Demange, C.-G. Marcus, and C. Herman, delegation members.

Y. Pagniez, French ambassador to the USSR, also took part in the meeting.

The Soviet side provided detailed explanations of the concept put forward by the Soviet Union of a nuclear-free world, a concept which embodies the philosophy of new political thinking. In this regard, the French delegation's attention was drawn to the principled assessments and conclusions contained in the speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the international forum "For a Nuclear-free World, for the Survival of Humanity."

Both sides expressed concern at the continuing arms race and the persisting international tension. The sides stated that East-West relations are currently at an important stage that has opened up as a result of major international events, specifically the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik.

Both sides are convinced that under present conditions it is necessary to step up efforts aimed at strengthening confidence and mutual understanding regarding the fundamental problems of security and international development. The French parliamentary representatives noted that their country wants a world without weapons -- nuclear weapons included -- and one without wars. They advocated strengthening existing machinery for restraining the arms race, first and foremost the ABM Treaty.

Recognizing the danger of the military-strategic consequences of the implementation of SDI programs, both delegations spoke out against spreading the arms race to space.

The Soviet side noted certain contradictions in the position of France, which continues to gear itself to building up arms, including nuclear arms; French firms are actually participating in the implementation of a number of projects linked with SDI.

Great attention was devoted to the progress of the all-European process and the prospects for the successful holding of the Vienna meeting. Mutual interest in developing and deepening the CSCE process was expressed.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1351

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET WEEKLY WARNS OF DANGER OF SDI COMPUTER ERROR

Moscow NEW TIME: in English No 9, 9 Mar 87 pp 18-21

[Article by Yuri Baturin: "Computer Error: What Could Ensnue...Hypothetical Scenes and Practical Analysis"]

[Text] "Tragedy may unfold in a matter of minutes, seconds even, in the 21st century. We are entering the era of a new technological revolution where the computer is a universal god worshipped even, I stress, by the military. Imagine such a hypothetical situation: a computer error may fire the alerted missiles and trigger off a senseless holocaust that will prove fatal to mankind. What is the outlook for peace in the maze of sophisticated hi-tech weaponry?"

Friedrich Lurrenmatt

An automatic satellite is launched
from an American cosmodrome on a
strictly peaceful research mission and
blows up within seconds of lift-off.
A setback...

A workshop on computing held in March 1986 in California, U.S.A., drew 61 participants of whom 36 signed the following statement: "The effective defence from nuclear annihilation of the lives, homes and property of the American people, as embodied by the Strategic Defence Initiative (Star Wars), requires highly reliable computer systems of unprecedented complexity. As experts in reliable computing, we strongly believe that a system meeting these requirements is technologically unfeasible."

Experts know what they are talking about. Indeed, the main danger of SDI lies not in laser or beam weapons, but in that all its combat systems are to depend on computer programmes.

Software is assigned a crucial role in American military planning. According to the Institute of Defence Analysis in Washington, 80 per cent of the weapon systems now on the drawing boards in the U.S. are to be largely computerized. In 1984, the development of military computer systems cost the U.S. \$11 billion, of which \$8.5 billion went into software; in 1985, software expenditure alone amounted to \$11 billion. The U.S. Electronic Industries Association expects this sum to have more than doubled by 1990 to account for about 20 per cent of the Pentagon's arms spending.

Incidentally, it is SDI's heavy dependence on computer software that adds enormously to the likelihood of the accidental outbreak of nuclear war. Here are just a few factors contributing to it.

Sophistication Factor

"There are some fundamental reasons why it [computer software] can never be made reliable enough that you could have confidence Star Wars would really work," said David Parnas, a leading authority on large-scale programming, appointed by the Pentagon's SDI Organization to its advisory committee on battle management software. He added that he had been promised a thousand dollars a day plus expenses and that as a man who wouldn't say no to a good pay offer and who likes to tackle research problems, he had initially succumbed to the temptation.

On second thoughts, however, he rejected the offer and submitted to the organization eight technical documents explaining why computer programmes would not work as required.

Imagine a huge tree trunk with tens of thousands of branches, each with a tip of its own. This is a crude illustration of the thousands of alternative variants the implementation of a programme involves. The situation is further complicated by the fact that as distinct from a tree, computer programmes have numerous "offshoots" interconnecting the main branches. It is impossible to keep all the offshoots in one's field of vision and to see to it that all the rules of programming logic are observed and that every offshoot is prepared to process the data coming in from all the others.

The programme for the "star wars" system is to comprise at least 10 million instructions (or even close to 100 million, at the estimate of some experts). Supposing you are to write a book of 10 million words. If you misuse a few of them, this may cause some eyebrows to be raised but not much else. Now, in a programme all the words must be used with the utmost accuracy and, furthermore, they must be properly interconnected.

A Shuttle-type spaceship requires about three million instructions, including ground-based launch-controlling and flight-tracking computers. This programme took years to work out. It was given innumerable ground tests, and has made it possible to carry out many successful flights. Whatever setbacks there were came from the programme "bugs." The Challenger tragedy confirmed that computers are error-prone: they did not

signal danger until a mere 15 seconds before the explosion. This accident revealed another danger factor.

Uncertainty Factor

The question arises: what would the Challenger tragedy or the abortive satellite launch in our scene 1 have entailed if they had happened after the deployment of strike weapons in space? The obvious answer is to be found in

SCENE TWO

A combat robot stationed on a space platform assesses the intensity of a flare-up, determines its bearings and other parameters and, without further ado, "pulls the trigger."

Indeed, who can tell for certain under the circumstances whether a spacecraft has blown up spontaneously or been destroyed by the enemy? The explosion would have been instantly responded to by the space weapon system control computers, whose only command would have been "Fire!" This is one of the most likely kinds of accident that could spark off a nuclear war.

Testing Factor

It is impossible to test the entire system in real conditions. The inevitable error: and defects in computer programmes can be put right only by running back and de-bugging a programme and then re-running it to make sure that everything goes right. The SDI system does not lend itself to testing, however. It can be endlessly developed and polished but never tested—except in the event of war.

The SDI Organization claims there is no need to test-run the system's programme as a whole, that it can be tested piecemeal on simulators. "The SDI people say they will test all their software before deploying it, but what if they don't anticipate the exact set of circumstances that the software will encounter somewhere down the road?" David Parnas asks. "You can't go back and fix the bug and start the nuclear war all over again!"

Programme-setters can never be

100 per cent sure of test results. Small errors that could eventually throw the whole system out of gear are C's perpetual scourge. A phrase current among programmers goes that any last error found in a programme is actually the one before last.

"A check can reveal the presence rather than the absence of a technical error," Edgar Dijkstra, the noted Dutch computer expert, remarked. Software can either cement the entire SDI system together or make it fall apart. The slightest errors could render the system inaccurate and, therefore, useless.

Interaction Factor

SDI is a provocation in the sense that if it is deployed Moscow will be compelled to respond with an "anti-SDI" system. "Unless the Soviets cooperate and tell us what characteristics to look for, the recognition algorithms written into the software could be wrong," David Parnas said. Obviously, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are not going to share their military secrets with one another. This rules out the possibility of the joint full-scale tests essential to the development of interacting systems. The result will be two non-adjusted and unmatched systems confronting each other. Such systems are even more likely to fail. Consequently, the reliability of military technical systems rapidly diminishes, and the probability of accidental war increases.

Time Factor

Since the SDI system is supposed to have a quick response, it will not even allow time for "waking up the President," as an SDI spokesman put it. Computers will have to distinguish between thousands of warheads and tens of thousands of "baits" (data will come in from an estimated 300,000 objects). Computers will have to track the trajectories of all the objects moving within the confines of the so-called "penitriod." Computers will have to select the optimum strategy by picking out the most important targets, aim weapons, and check whether enemy missiles and warheads have been destroyed. The Americans expect all this to take the computers some 100-300 seconds, or as long as it will take you to visualize

SCENE THREE

Within seconds of the situation described in Scene One, the SDI computers make decisions that normally require days, weeks and even months of concerted action by intelligence experts, combat officers, generals, Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief. "Star war" begins...

What we have here is a situation where the fate of mankind is decided by automatic computers. Just one error will be enough to touch off a catastrophic chain reaction beyond human control.

In the opinion of Pentagon experts, U.S. servicemen themselves are of no small danger to military computer systems. One serviceman systematically sabotaged a computer, for instance. The sabotage factor is a matter of particular concern, as evidenced by a special report on the possibility of accidental war drawn up by an Ohio university research group. It follows from the report that since the end of World War II at least 439 U.S. servicemen have been "demobbed on psychiatric grounds. Missileman selection procedures do not include tests for mental health and psychological aptitude.

Let us see what the chances of maintaining world peace are in the light of the foregoing.

Reliability Factor

Supposing SDI's immunity to each factor is 0.95, i.e., almost 100 per cent. This is a very high index for such complex systems and, if it were correct, would even do SDI credit. Calculations show, however, that the "almost" would reduce the actual reliability of the system (with all factors taken into account) to 0.73. This is not to say that any error or malfunction would necessarily lead to combat action, so let us assume the average reliability index to be 0.84.

Just imagine that you want to buy a TV-set for the sole purpose of watching

nightly newscasts. If you learn that the cat a salesman offers you could break down 16 times in a hundred days or about six times a month, (i.e., has a reliability index of 0.84) you will certainly dismiss the offer as a swindle. Therefore, phrases like "SDI is a bluff," which one comes across in the papers, should not be regarded as mere exercises in journalism; they go right to the heart of the matter.

After Parnas had withdrawn from the SDI advisory committee he was replaced by James Horning, an executive of a leading computer-manufacturing firm. Horning took a somewhat different view. "I cannot flatly say," he wrote, "that no piece of software can be deployed in the 1990s to control a ballistic missile defence system. It all depends on how much functionality, coordination and reliability are demanded of it. The dimension in which the major sacrifice will probably be made is in reliability." This makes the outlook for peace bleaker still.

Just how vulnerable software is can be judged from the following examples.

—In 1979, an American Venus-bound space probe fell short of its target, entailing a loss of half a billion dollars. The reason for this was a comma having been mixed up with a colon in the probe path correction programme.

—One version of the F-16 navigational programme would have turned the plane upside down each time it crossed the equator. This defect in the programme was revealed by a computer during a simulator test. One wonders how many latent flaws still remain undetected.

—The wing aileron of the U.S. X-29 experimental fighter plane is such that three onboard computers have to adjust its attitude for list and pitch forty times a second. If all three computers malfunction at the same time, the plane will simply fall apart in mid-air.

Now let's go back to the outbreak of "star war."

SCENE FOUR

The catastrophe has become an accomplished fact, but fighting is still going on.

SDI has already done its job, and SCI, (Strategic Computing Initiative) comes

into play. The purpose of SCI, the Pentagon's other billion-dollar programme, is to develop seeing, hearing, speaking and reasoning "expert computers" of a new (fifth) generation. The Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under the U.S. Defence Department wants this entirely new computer technology to be geared to the needs of the armed forces in particular.

Today's fighter pilot controls his plane only to the extent to which the computer allows him. He cannot take risks unwarranted by his plane's flight specifications. What's more, the plane can be designed to ignore instructions that contradict those of the computer. A computer can disconnect manual controls and get the missiles set for combat action automatically.

So far computers cannot think, reason or read your mind. However, McDonnell Douglas is already working, as part of SCI, on a computer system intended to scan the waves emitted by the pilot's brain, monitor his pulse, heart-muscle contractions and other vital bodily functions, determine his fighting capacity on the basis of the data received, and feed him exactly as much information as he can process at a given moment. Many of the pilot's duties will be taken over by a "robot co-pilot" now being developed by the DARPA which will obey oral commands and even acknowledge them vocally.

The SCI data gathering and processing systems (referred to by the military as CCC, the initials of their three functions—command, control and communication) can follow developments in various theatres of operations. This capability is of vital importance in modern combat, but the CCC systems regularly sound false alarms that put troops on the alert.

In the late seventies and early eighties U.S. experts were concerned about the frequent malfunctioning of the Pentagon's Worldwide Military Command and Control System (known as WIMEX). John Bradley, once in charge of testing its computer network, warned that the system was not reliable enough for the army command to depend on it. According to Bradley, not more than one false alarm in ten becomes public knowledge. Since WIMEX computers were in-

corporated into the North American Air Defence system (NORAD) in 1979, U.S. nuclear forces have been repeatedly alerted on false alarms, with strategic aircraft taking off and missiles readied for launching. The enormous BETA communication system, adopted by the U.S. army, is not much better. A report published by the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee in October 1980 said that over the past 18 months alone the NORAD command had issued, because of various technical troubles, 151 false warnings of a "nuclear attack" on the United States. During a subsequent WIMEX check, computers erred repeatedly in the space of 12 hours.

SCI provides for the formation of whole computer-controlled robot armies. The U.S. Navy has already developed NT-3 robots for handling heavy cargoes and ROBERT-1s which locate fires, sources of chemical agents and enemy craft and have a 400-word vocabulary; the latter can find their own way to battery recharging stations. The widely publicized expedition to the scene of the Titanic shipwreck in 1986 had the secret purpose of testing the Jason Junior military underwater robot.

The Grumman Corporation is working on the Ranger vehicle which "looks where it is going," and can negotiate any rugged terrain. Future modifications will be able to spy on enemy positions and go into action as robot tanks.

Odecs, a product of the Odetics company, can load and unload artillery shells, bypass outpost lines, pinpoint enemy artillery positions and return fire.

DARPA is now developing a computer "strategist" which will process data from radars and artificial earth satellites into recommendations to flag officers on how to organize naval combat involving an aircraft carrier unit complete with dozens of surface vessels and submarines. This combat control system is supposed to be able to analyze unchecked data, predict likely developments, work out action strategy and scenarios based on past experience and

make logical decisions. DARPA openly favours the introduction of artificial intelligence as a normal method of military decision-making, and proposes to extend this process to include control of strategic nuclear missiles.

All this suggests truly apocalyptic

SCENE FIVE

Military robots, commanded by a computer "strategist," finish off the few surviving humans.

The chances of peace are further diminished by "hackers"—software and hardware experts who tamper with computer systems they have no authorized access to.

Back in 1973 one such meddler managed to tap off data from the ARPANET computer system at the U.S. Department of Defence.

Sabotage Factor

A group of Milwaukee hackers found its way into the computer centre of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Another group managed to connect an extension line to the master computer at the U.S. Defence Department and tried to make changes in its top-secret programmes. Gaining unauthorized access to computers may result, the U.S. press warns, in the launching of American missiles or in actuating other strike weapons. Such, incidentally, is the story of the "War Games" movie hit about a schoolboy who all but provoked World War III by connecting his personal computer to that of a missile control centre. Walter Parkes and Larry Lasker, the script writers, spent two years watching the progress of a strategic nuclear weapon research programme. Said Parkes: "You want to believe that nuclear defence is in good hands, however, the more we looked into it, the more we realized that nobody is in control."

The danger of accidental war is made very real not only by the actions of individuals but also by the possibility of provocative action on the part of third countries. For instance, the inquiry into the case of Jonathan Pollard, a U.S. naval intelligence officer who worked for Israel, revealed that the secrets he sold Tel Aviv included codes and programmes for tank, missile and warplane control computers as well as codes of the U.S. Sixth Fleet based in the Mediterranean.

. . .

A computer "eliminated" thousands of citizens in a Swedish province recently. "Resurrecting" them took quite some time and cost millions of dollars. An operator had requested data from a computer on the province's total population and the number of deaths over a certain period. The machine mistook a hyphen between figures for a minus sign, made a mess of input data processing as a result, and erased all recordings from its memory without "thinking twice."

If a military computer wipes mankind off the face of the earth "without thinking twice," there will be no resurrecting it. We still have time to prevent this happening, but we must act instead of merely looking on.

/9274

CSO: 1812/95

CANADA: U.S. STAND ON SDI, ARM TREATY DISCUSSED

External Affairs Minister Clark

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 6 Mar 87 p A16

[Article by Arch MacKenzie]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Canada will view with "profound concern" any United States or Soviet act that worsens the nuclear arms balance, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark says.

He said he was referring to any move to start testing the controversial U.S. Star Wars space defence system, after being briefed yesterday by Paul Nitze, President Ronald Reagan's special adviser.

Nitze flew in from Washington to meet with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Clark and Defence Minister Perrin Beatty. He is in the course of consulting allies about Reagan's intention to start interpreting the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty to allow testing of the space defence system formally called the Strategic Defence Initiative.

His rounds were interrupted by the Soviet offer last Friday to negotiate the removal from Europe of medium-range missiles.

Broad interpretation

Clark's statement said Canada has "been assured by the United States that no decision to move to a broad interpretation (of the treaty) has yet been taken, nor will be taken before this process is completed."

But U.S. news reports have said flatly that American negotiators, meeting with their Soviet counterparts at the arms control talks in Geneva, have been told to insist on the so-called broad treaty interpretation that would allow Star Wars testing.

Yesterday's consultation came as the New Democratic Party launched a one-day House of Commons debate seeking to have Canada withdraw permission for testing the cruise missile.

As well, Viktor Karpov, director of arms control for the Soviet foreign ministry, arrived for the third annual set of arms control talks between Canada and the Soviet Union.

Karpov, formerly chief Soviet negotiator at Geneva, will be dealing today and tomorrow with senior officials.

Research support

Clark said Canada "would greatly regret the implementation of any policy, by either party, with regard to the ABM treaty, that might adversely affect the Geneva negotiations, especially in view of recent developments on intermediate-range nuclear forces."

He said the U.S. should continue at Geneva to seek arms reductions and reiterated Canadian support for research on Star Wars within the "current restrictive interpretation of the ABM treaty."

Canada has declined U.S. offers to participate at the government level in Star Wars research and opposes any move to start testing the high-tech components of the system, which relies on lasers, computers and other complex hardware.

But Mulroney has said private industry can participate in Star Wars if it gets the chance.

"We welcome the assurance by Secretary of State (George) Shultz that the U.S. administration considers premature any decision on deployment of a ballistic missile (Star wars) defence at this point," Clark's statement said.

OTTAWA CITIZEN 12 February Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 12 Feb 87 p A8

[Text]

U.S. State Secretary George Shultz said Sunday that President Reagan will not decide during his last two years in office whether the U.S. will start deploying a Star Wars system in the early 1990s.

If this is the final decision — Shultz said he was reflecting Reagan's thinking — it will be welcomed by friend and foe alike, both domestically and worldwide. Placing an anti-ballistic missile system in space would require an amendment to the U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty — or U.S. withdrawal from it.

For the last three years, the U.S. has maintained that the Strategic Defence Initiative was a research program designed to determine whether or not an ABM defence was feasible. Washington held that such a stage would not be reached until the early or mid-1990s.

Then, out of the blue, Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger began promoting the idea of phased early deployment of a partial defensive system both on land and in space. He

said it might start in the early 1990s and that Reagan could take that decision while still in office.

This mini-Star Wars proposal has created even more of a stir than the main act. It is the creature of those who believe the U.S. should press ahead as quickly as possible in strategic defence regardless of the opposition in Congress, the State Department, the NATO alliance and Moscow.

There is another controversy raging in Washington that's closely linked to SDI. It concerns what types of testing are permitted by the ABM treaty — whether some "components" of new systems not envisaged in the agreement could be tried out in space without violating the accord.

The U.S. now follows the so-called "narrow" approach that would rule these out. But strong factions, including Weinberger's, are convinced that a "broad" interpretation is justified and that it would allow tests in space.

The president has not yet taken a stand. But Shultz said that the administration would consult with Congress and America's allies before deciding the issue.

Senator Sam Nunn, Democratic chairman of the Senate armed forces committee, wrote to Reagan last week warning him that a decision to go for the broad concept would run contrary to the Senate's original interpretation, would be considered as the end to Reagan's arms control efforts, would risk a "constitutional crisis of profound dimensions" and could force legislators to retaliate by making deep cuts in Star Wars spending.

Arms control is at a crossroads in Washington today. Prudence dictates that Reagan make no irrevocable decisions on matters of such fundamental importance. Canada should join other Western allies in urging the president to make haste slowly for the sake of peace and stability.

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 24 Feb 87 pp A1, A2

[Article by Ian Hunter]

[Text]

The U.S. administration has adopted a broader interpretation of the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union to allow an early deployment of its space-based Star Wars defence system, says Canadian disarmament ambassador Douglas Roche.

"Canada is very unhappy about this," and plans to protest the move, he said in an interview with the *Citizen* Monday.

Roche's information goes beyond recent reports that the U.S. is only considering implementing a broader interpretation of the ABM treaty. If his information is correct, the U.S. has gone ahead with a decision that could have severe consequences at the arms-control bargaining table.

The Soviets have contended that the broad interpretation — allowing testing in space — would effectively kill the 1972 ABM treaty, fueling an arms race in space.

Roche, who represents Canada on disarmament issues at the United Nations, said the government will express its feelings to U.S. senior arms control adviser Paul Nitze when he comes to brief Canadian officials on the current ABM talks next week.

"We are rather surprised to note the alacrity with which the United States is proceeding with plans to deploy that which has not yet been produced," Roche said.

But he rejected a demand made earlier Monday by the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament that the government suspend further cruise missile testing, beginning with this morning's scheduled flight, because of the reported U.S. "dismantling" of the ABM treaty.

The centre, partially funded by the government, has supported cruise testing in the past because

the agreement with the U.S. was based on the existence of a narrowly-interpreted ABM treaty and a second strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II) which the U.S. has not ratified.

A U.S. report today seems to confirm the information Roche has received. United Press International quotes Washington officials as saying the administration is expected to implement the broader interpretation in the next few weeks.

The report says the Pentagon, at the direction of the White House, is analysing the expense of testing Star Wars under the wider interpretation and is expected to submit its report next week.

The officials also told UPI the administration appears ready to proceed with the broader interpretation of the pact regardless of the outcome of a series of consultations with U.S. allies.

Roche said a directive from Washington to Nitze and other U.S. negotiators on the weekend

"appears to cut off discussion about what should be allowed or not allowed under the ABM treaty."

"Our view is that there should be an honest attempt at a compromise between the two parties as to precisely what is allowed (under the treaty)," he said.

But he added the Canadian government position is that without such a compromise, the restricted interpretation of the treaty as supported by Canada and other NATO allies should be followed.

Officials in External Affairs Minister Joe Clark's office refused comment on Roche's charges, saying they had received no official word from the U.S. that they would be adopting the broader interpretation.

The wider interpretation explained to the Soviets at the Geneva arms-control talks would permit the Pentagon to test in space the exotic technology developed in American

laboratories for a possible space-based defence against Soviet missiles.

Under the broader interpretation, the U.S. uses the ABM treaty to justify the expansion of Star Wars testing into space to follow up on recent breakthroughs in research conducted in labs, within the limits of the pact. The Soviets seek to restrict Star Wars testing to labs.

The administration argues that sophisticated technologies such as computer-driven space-based sensors, target and aiming devices and killer vehicles did not exist when the treaty was signed in 1972.

Roche said the Canadian government will tell Nitze again next week that it insists "very strongly" on a restrictive interpretation of the treaty.

"We are completely opposed to any early deployment," he declared.

But he said Canada will not go back on its word to allow cruise testing for five years under a 1983 agreement. He noted the agreement is up for renewal in 1988 "and we will make a decision at that time."

John Lamb, executive director of the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, said at a press conference Monday it is time for Canada to "up the ante" because of the U.S. failure to ratify SALT II and indications the U.S. would "re-interpret" the ABM treaty to allow deployment of a space-based defence system.

This was another step toward dismantling the treaty, Lamb said.

In effect, he charged, the U.S. administration has broken the contract with Canada for testing the air-launched cruise missile by backing out of both positions.

Lamb said the testing will not take place, as expected when it was agreed to by Canada in 1983, "under an arms control regime placing some limits on cruise missiles."

The first of a new series of flights to test the low-level, nuclear-capable missile was to take place early today from above the Beaufort Sea, south down the Mackenzie River Valley and east to the Primrose Lake weapons range near Cold Lake, Alta.

Lamb credited the Canadian government for consistently urging the restrictive interpretation of the ABM treaty, most recently in a letter from Clark to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz two weeks ago.

But because of the "de facto unilateral re-interpretation" of the treaty by the U.S., "it is time for Canada and the other allies to up the ante in making clear to Washington that this step runs counter to our security interest and that we want to see it reversed," he said.

Lamb warned that a broader interpretation of the ABM treaty would likely destroy chances for an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union during the next two years or longer, since the Soviets won't agree to cut their offensive arsenal unless restrictions on space defences are agreed to.

"The cavalier manner in which this re-interpretation has been instituted by the Reagan administration will seriously undermine the principle of (NATO) consultation," Lamb added.

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 26 Feb 87 p A8

[Text]

President Reagan is said to be on the point of authorizing a broad interpretation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty — as a legal cover for conducting tests in space of Star Wars components. By doing so (perhaps next Monday), he will defy both Congress and allies.

He must be persuaded otherwise.

Time has virtually expired for Canada to do what it clearly should do: join other U.S. allies and congressional opponents to try to convince Reagan the broad-interpretation route is madness. Our influence in this matter is minimal: we don't have Washington's responsibility, we aren't a party to the ABM treaty, and our own contribution to Western security is modest.

Still, we must wield what influence we can. Right now.

This is not just a question of interpreting the terms of a controversial bilateral agreement nearly 15 years old. It is much more than that. If the U.S. unilaterally proceeds to test components of a proposed strategic defence system in space — that would be the import of such an historic decision — the restraints on both sides in the 1972 treaty will be abandoned overnight and a new arms race in space begun.

Canada's disarmament ambassador, Douglas Roche, was right to express concern — indeed right to tip off the public ahead of time that the U.S. administration was adop-

ting the broader definition.

We quibble, though, with Roche's contention that a decision to allow space tests necessarily means that the U.S. "is proceeding with plans to deploy that which has not yet been produced." That decision cannot be taken until some space defence system is deemed feasible. The time when such a point can be reached is many, many tests away.

That's cold comfort, of course, for those who want a deployment decision deferred at least until the U.S. Congress and NATO support such a move.

But Star Wars research in the last two years of Reagan's term could be conducted primarily in a space configuration, even though Congress clamps down on funds for that purpose. Then the all-important deployment decision would be bound to be influenced in that direction, if not predetermined, before the next president came to power.

If the U.S. conducts space testing, it will make it difficult, if not impossible, for a strategic arms control agreement to be reached between Washington and Moscow.

Since America's allies, including Canada, believe such an accord is possible this year with the new Soviet leadership, they must all do whatever they can to help it along. That means making immediate — and strong — representations to the president not to do anything that would thwart such an agreement.

/9317

CSO: 5220/35

CANADIAN EDITORIAL ON GORBACHEV ATTACK ON SDI AT PEACE FORUM

17 February Editorial

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 17 Feb 87 p A8

[Text]

Mikhail Gorbachev used the platform of his super-peace conference in Moscow to blast the Americans about Star Wars. He said "the survival of humanity" is at stake if the arms race reaches outer space.

The temptation to attack the U.S. over its Strategic Defence Initiative was obviously irresistible. The debate in Washington about phased deployment was too good to ignore. But, contrary to Western speculation, the Soviet leader didn't come up with any new arms control proposal.

The flaw in Gorbachev's rhetoric is that he refused to take the next logical step. If he is really concerned about the arms race spreading to space, he should consider working with the Americans to develop a new superpower equilibrium, one resting on both offensive and defensive weapons. The current balance of terror rests essentially on offensive weapons — Mutual Assured Destruction.

Lord Carrington, NATO's secretary general, recently addressed this issue. He said: "The more serious the Soviet concern about SDI, the more sensible it must be to them to get together with the Americans to negotiate mutually acceptable answers to practical questions of that kind." He also said: "It is not realistic to base the strategic balance on

a belief that technology will stand still."

It simply won't. Soviet strategic defence research proves that. Neither side can afford to abandon advanced research in the present arms control stalemate.

President Reagan's long-standing offer to negotiate a joint strategic defence regime with the Soviets is still on the table. Serious negotiations between the superpowers on reducing strategic offensive weapons — and on the terms for deploying strategic defensive ones if feasible — is long overdue.

Gorbachev's concern about Star Wars can only be met if he stops attempting to blackmail Reagan through public propaganda and starts coming to terms with him through private negotiation.

At the negotiating table in Geneva, the atmosphere is much more conducive to progress than it was at the Moscow peace-fest Monday. Instead of advancing the cause of peace, the Kremlin chief tried to frighten his audience into submission.

The most that can be said about the Gorbachev performance is that it was a disappointing follow-up to Moscow's rather liberal pronouncements of the past few days. If he keeps it up, we're in for a long wait before that next summit.

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 19 Feb 87 p A8

[Text]

Mikhail Gorbachev knew what he was doing when he told the celebrity Moscow peace conference on Monday that American negotiators in Geneva had asked the Soviets to approve a "broad interpretation" of the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty. He claimed they had "officially suggested legitimizing" such an understanding.

This was an obvious ploy by the Soviet leader to upset Washington's allies. Gorbachev wanted them to believe that their U.S. ally had made a highly controversial proposal to the Soviets behind their backs. He also inferred that Washington did so despite State Secretary George Shultz's recent assurances the allies would be fully consulted before any such move on the ABM treaty.

The truth is that Reagan has not yet made up his mind on this matter. His administration is split on it. His top advisers are at odds with each other on both the question of conducting Strategic Defence Initiative tests in space and that of deploying an initial phase of SDI.

Gorbachev deliberately tried to exploit these divisions — and indeed those within Congress. The question of additional funding for Star Wars research is now before a new Congress that is more inclined to cut such funds — particularly if it believes the president is going too far and too fast.

Doubtless Gorbachev believes he was right to reveal the alleged U.S. negotiating posi-

tion; he is determined to stop Star Wars dead in its tracks, for he considers it destabilizing. He refuses outright to co-operate with the U.S. in planning for a joint regime of defensive and offensive arms.

Thanks to Gorbachev, Washington's allies — and Congressional leaders — will use this occasion to press the U.S. administration again not to depart from its current position that rules out both space testing and deployment in the absence of an agreement with the Soviets. They will also press for the promised consultation, and demand that it take place before any decision is made to change current policy.

The allies cannot stop the Americans from making whatever arms control proposals they want to. But it's highly unlikely Washington has jumped the gun in Geneva. The State Department said its negotiators had simply repeated the well-known Reagan view that a broad interpretation was "fully justified."

As for consultation, the allies are in trouble if Kenneth Adelman reflects Washington's views. The head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency recently said it was nice to have their views, "but it's nicer to have the views of the allies on issues they know more about."

Let's hope any allied consultations will be with U.S. officials who know more about diplomacy.

/9317

CSO: 5220/36

INDIAN COMMUNIST PAPER ON GORBACHEV NUCLEAR-FREE FORUM SPEECH

New Delhi PATRIOT in English 18 Feb 87 p 4

[Editorial: "Nuclear Guillotine"]

[Text]

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in his address to the International Forum "For Nuclear-free World, For Survival of Humanity" in Moscow recently explained with honesty and competence the dangers over-hanging human-kind. Man, he pointed out, has become technically capable of terminating his own existence and there are some who appear intent on pushing mankind under the guillotine and kicking the tripwire. He has warned the world, once again, of the consequences of nuclear over-manship and attempts to "reinterpret" the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to allow for the positioning of nuclear weapons in space. Its international ramifications are best understood by the concept of national sovereignty and its extension into the airspace above which is threatened by the placement of weapons of mass destruction. Mr Gorbachev has hinted that a reinterpretation of the ABM Treaty will be an annulment of the treaty and will open up an arms race in outer space which, given the proclivity to violence and the fact that nuclear weapons have already been used twice against other human beings, could bring about the sudden termination of the human race by design or even accident. The greater part of humanity is in agreement with what Mr Gorbachev has stated but it appears helpless in the face of the US determination to deploy the first phase of the Star Wars programme by using methods which even influential opinion in the US has described as "slithering" with all its slimy connotations.

Mr Gorbachev has also taken the opportunity to demystify the internal developments in his country. Soviet international policy, he pointed out, is more than ever determined by domestic policy which is concentrating on constructive endeavours to improve the quality of life of the Soviet people. By seeking new ap-

proaches and methods to resolve international problems in today's complex and contradictory world the Soviet Union has sought to review something which once seemed axiomatic: that after Hiroshima and Nagasaki world war has ceased to be a continuation of politics by other means. Nuclear war would incinerate the architects of such policy, he has pointed out.

But his treatise for peace is not confined to the nuclear danger alone. He has called for an end to nuclear weapons by year 2000 to be supplemented by an international security system which would organically blend the main spheres of security — military, political, economic and humanitarian. He has said that all this would require stringent supervision and international verification including in its ambit foreign bases to remove any element of dishonesty. To all this there can be only one rational response but there are some who would prefer to quibble.

/9274

CSO: 5250/0010

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

USSR OPINION POLL ON NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 9, 9 Mar 87 pp 6-8

[Opinion by King Hussein ibn Talal, of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan]

[Text]

Though individual human beings are basically decent and peace-loving, yet humanity as a whole has been plagued throughout recorded history by an affliction of war and the use of force. These destructive courses of action were followed in pursuit of conceived national objectives irrespective of the human suffering visited on both the aggressor and the victim.

Divine revelations and various human approaches were advanced to arrest this development. Unfortunately, not much success was achieved in the field of the peaceful resolution of conflicts. Our present century has witnessed two major and very devastating wars, the last of which witnessed the annihilation of Nagasaki and Hiroshima by atomic weapons. The advent of the atomic and nuclear era brought the sober realization that things cannot continue as before. The very survival of humanity is now at stake. The total devastation visited on the two Japanese cities in 1945 added a much needed impetus to the common search for a really effective mechanism to promote international cooperation and collective security and arrest the trend for war and the use of force. Subsequently, the United Nations Organization was founded out of the ashes to provide such a framework and to serve as the collective conscience of mankind.

We believe that strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter and the free will of the member states to abide by its resolutions constitute the best guarantee for our globe and the continued existence and survival of mankind.

Thus peace becomes not only possible without nuclear arms but a "must" and top priority in the nuclear age. Under these circumstances there cannot be a limited or a "winnable" war

Mutual and assured destruction to all is the logical aftermath of a nuclear holocaust.

Thus humanity must continue in its efforts to eliminate these weapons of awesome destruction. Arms disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field, should top the agenda of every state, organization or individual. The close to one trillion dollars spent each year on arms should be channelled to meet the pressing needs of mankind. It is an illusion, and a very dangerous one at that, to assume that the accumulation of more nuclear weapons and the perfection of their delivery systems and destructiveness will lead to better or enhanced security. On the contrary, the nuclear arms race leads, with the passage of time, to more and more entrants to this gruesome race.

A free-for-all nuclear capability will lead, by design or accident, to the realization of the very danger that the majority of mankind is seeking to eliminate. While we support all efforts aimed at the reduction and ultimate elimination of all nuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons, we also demand that the security of non-nuclear states should be safeguarded against the nuclear threat. This is particularly relevant and very pressing in the case of the Middle East (where Israel has joined the nuclear club) and Africa (where the racist South African regime has attained a nuclear capacity with which to threaten the people of Africa).

We pray that nuclear weapons that rose a threat to us all will be, at the same time, the driving force behind a sustained and collective international effort to free humanity from this ever present threat in order to devote our abundant resources to the urgent task of meeting the challenges that face us all.

[Opinion by Karl Bildt, a prominent Swedish politician and Riksdag deputy, is leader of the Moderate Party]

The stock of knowledge man has acquired will always be with him. As a result of progress in nuclear physics, we shall always live in a world where we cannot rule out the possible use of the atom for destructive purposes.

For that reason, I do not think a world without nuclear arms likely. Instead, we must devise an international system of stability whereby neither the existence of these arms nor the chance of any new state coming to possess them would threaten the world.

Stability presupposes equilibrium.

Military stability based on equilibrium is conducive to political cooperation. Any military imbalance could lead to a temptation to exploit it to further political ends, in which case the world would be in jeopardy.

A drastic reduction in U.S. and Soviet offensive ballistic nuclear systems, combined with substantial curbs on defensive strategic systems, would provide a better foundation for a more stable world than the one in which we are living today.

[Opinion by Frans Lurvink, president of the Netherlands Alerdinck Foundation Centre for East-West Communications]

I consider the issue of creating a nuclear-free world the second most important that confronts us, as our first imperative must be to create an atmosphere of trust between East and West. The reasons for the arms race must be eliminated. These are not simply that the two systems are very dissimilar but that, more importantly, the people living within these two systems do not understand each other's mentality, or the functioning of the other system.

For three years I have been arranging meetings between journalists from East and West. Each time I realize that the Americans don't understand the Russians, and the Russians don't understand the Americans. Yet they have much in common. Both countries are politically young. We West Europeans have a longer history, and for this reason I think we understand both the Russians and the Americans better.

A nuclear-free world is first and foremost a world of mutual understanding in which the representatives of both systems have a clear idea of how the opposing system develops and operates. When this understanding has been reached, it will be obvious that in reality the differences between East and West are not so very great and can be overcome. Then nuclear arms will be unnecessary.

I think nuclear weapons should be destroyed. They are a threat not only to people in the East and the West, but to mankind as a whole. Yet unless East and West cooperate to destroy these weapons, it will be impossible to moni-

tor the emergence of nuclear weapons in, for instance, Libya, Egypt, Israel, Pakistan and India. Dozens of countries will become nuclear powers within the next twenty, or, perhaps, even ten, years. Some of them are small, and not infrequently their governments change annually. That would be far more dangerous than nuclear weapons in the hands of Gorbachev and Reagan, who are after all both reasonable men.

East and West must take the first steps towards a united world. It is incumbent on them to come to terms, reach agreement and announce that war is no longer possible.

One further reason the West stockpiles arms is its lack of information as to what is happening in the Soviet Union. The view is current with us that the Soviet Union is not "transparent" enough and that at the very least a stethoscope is needed to find out what is going on there. This makes us nervous and, as we do not know what is taking place, we arm ourselves to meet any contingency.

In this respect Mikhail Gorbachev is doing something extremely important with his policy of openness. It is perhaps even more important than a nuclear arms agreement. It shows us the Soviet Union as it really is, with all the mistakes and problems that confront it. That breeds confidence.

Nuclear arms are unquestionably lethal. But conventional arms are not harmless either. Consequently, both types must be cut. We must learn to live in a world without wars. We must get used to the idea that we can no longer do otherwise.

[Dr Rudolf Agsten, member of the Political Commission, secretary of the Central Board of the German Liberal Democratic Party and a member of the Presidium of the GDR People's Chamber]

How do I imagine the framework of international stability? Certainly not as a military framework. In this nuclear-space age no international issue can be decided from a position of strength. Armed confrontation would result in the annihilation of the human race. A distinctive feature of the new thinking should be an awareness that pressing global issues can only be resolved for the benefit of humanity through peaceful coexistence. It is this position that sets the tone for the socialist states in the international arena.

Stability in international affairs will be possible if the ruling quarters in the U.S. and other countries also come to

understand that peaceful coexistence—which, incidentally, will not only benefit the socialist states, as is so often claimed, but is in the interests of the capitalist countries as well—represents the sole guarantee of humanity's survival.

It would then be possible, having drafted a whole complex of bilateral and multilateral agreements in the fields of the economy, science and culture, to tackle jointly those major issues on the agenda today that are specifically due to the rapid progress in science and technology and the extremely dramatic situation in the developing countries.

[Prof Rasheeduddin Kham, of India's Jawaharlal Nehru University]

I have a dual perception of the present situation. In the first place I fear a possible nuclear catastrophe, inevitable unless the leaders of the great powers end the senseless arms race. This insanity derives not only from an abnormal mentality, but also from the lunatic doctrine of mutually assured destruction. My fear also stems from the fact that far from diminishing, the arms race is assuming increasingly new forms. An opposite instance is afforded by the militarization of space behind the fig leaf of SDI.

On the other hand, my hopes of positive change are growing. Your country has come out with a whole range of disarmament initiatives. It is enough to recall Mikhail Gorbachev's January 15, 1986, statement which the U.S. and other NATO states should examine most carefully. We should likewise recall the proposal of the Delhi Six for a nuclear test ban, the reduction of nuclear arsenals, and the prevention of space militarization.

Up to now a world without nuclear arms has been only an ideal. True, nuclear weapons are not being used today and the emphasis is on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. But as accidents at atomic power plants have shown, tragedies cannot be ruled out. Incidentally, ordinary chemical processes are also dangerous. It is enough to recall the Bhopal disaster. For that matter conventional arms constitute an enormous danger as, in the event of their large-scale use vast conflagrations

will ensue. As a result, upon catching fire the plastics used in buildings and households will contaminate the atmosphere with poisonous fumes.

But the greatest danger emanates from nuclear weapons. Hence I favour their complete abolition.

The paramount prerequisite for this is for world leaders to show political will. At Geneva and Reykjavik, the Soviet Union demonstrated its ability to surmount prejudice. Unfortunately I cannot say the same of the U.S. administration, which is obsessed with Soviet "aggressiveness" and "expansionism." Hence the erroneous policy the U.S. is pursuing. Were public opinion in the U.S. capable of changing that policy, all of humanity would benefit. However, many Americans know nothing of the Soviet Union's love of peace and, generally speaking, know little about the U.S.S.R.

For that reason, the propagation of truthful information around the world is an essential precondition for nuclear disarmament. The education system should also contribute by promoting the value of peace and coexistence. I believe a new Renaissance in world culture is vital. We must recognize and accept the multifarious and pluralistic character of the world in the domains of culture, the economy and ideology, and differences in the social sphere. The overriding principle on earth must be to persuade, not to coerce. Wars begin in human minds, they say. I think a nuclear-free world should likewise be conceived in human minds.

[Niko Schwarz, Uruguayan journalist and member of the editorial board of the newspaper LA HORA]

All of us would like to see a future without war.

What is the essence of the enormous paradox in the contemporary international situation? Scientific and technological progress holds out an unprecedented prospect of a better quality of life for everyone and the eradication of epidemics and disease, along with the hunger and illiteracy inherited from the exploiting regimes, colonialism and neocolonialism. But modern technology is capable of eradicating not only these ulcers but also humanity itself.

Two concrete objectives face Latin America. The first is by supporting the peacemaking activities of the Contadora group to prevent war from breaking out in Central America and U.S. troops from invading Nicaragua. The second is to prevent the immediate spread of the nuclear threat to the south of our continent through the establishment of military bases on the Malvinas and Easter Island. For it is in this way that militarist forces are seeking to circumvent the Tlatelolco Treaty, which sets forth Latin America's nuclear-free status.

[Volodia Teitelboim, political analyst from Chile]

That morning and the three following days the Cosmos Hotel in Moscow lived up to its name as never before. It was the meeting place of more than a thousand delegates from over eighty countries. They represented all the arts, sciences and professions. It was a truly cosmic gathering. Here one could meet new film stars and luminaries of old Hollywood. At the entrance to the hotel throngs of young autograph hunters besieged Gregory Peck. In the lobby stood the singer and composer Yoko Ono, aloof and with that aura of the distant East that did not isolate her from those around her but rather gave her a look of quiet abstraction. Film director Milos Forman passed by practically unnoticed, like most of the participants in the forum.

I catch myself rubbing shoulders with all sort of celebrities without giving any thought to who they are. I look closer, and suddenly I recognize Maria Schell, Maria Volonté and also Marina Vlady whose Russian beauty has blossomed to the full with the years. I see a man using his hands to help convey his ideas and I recognize Costa Gavras. The whole cinema world is here, not excluding Klaus Maria Brandauer, the demonic Mephisto of the film of that name. Without doubt the most colourful of them all is Peter Ustinov who is constantly in the focus of the TV cameras. He answers questions partly in Russian, partly in English. I marvel at his erudition and charm. The assumption that most movie actors are fascinating but shallow people is wrong. That myth is definite-

ly dispelled by what they have to say at the forum and how they say it.

The Cosmos is naturally inconceivable without cosmonauts. And sure enough here is the space traveller Georgi Grechko chatting with a writer who knows that the Earth is no paradise but could very well be one. The writer is Graham Greene. At the final gathering in the Kremlin, Greene, having in mind his own Catholic faith, observed that in the course of his life he had devoted much attention to Latin America where the religious work together with the Marxists.

I have suddenly realized that, following my personal inclinations, I have been focussing my attention here on artists and writers. At the forum, however, there were eight parallel sections or round tables devoted to the various professions. For instance, at the science round table a Harvard University professor voiced his fears that man might use his knowledge to the detriment of humankind, for the development of lethal weapons.

In another meeting hall the discussion revolved around the danger hanging not only over man but also over the house he lives in and without which his existence is inconceivable—Nature. We must all be ecologists.

For several unforgettable days the Cosmos Hotel played host to all professions, all ideologies, all religions—united by the common awareness that the human race must not be destroyed. And that danger does exist today at the

threshold of the 21st century, that is, if the war machine, the military-industrial complex, allows itself to be blinded by what for it is the most profitable business deal of all time. Should that happen, it might very well be that in the next century dollars might no longer be in circulation for the simple and terrible reason that there will be no one left to use them.

The nuclear weapon can only serve the purposes of the protagonists of the present unjust state of affairs, a feature of which is the bombshell of the developing countries' foreign debt that is bound to explode sooner or later. When this question was discussed at the forum, Fidel Castro seemed to be present in spirit and Mikhail Gorbachev was there in the flesh. Now, the Soviet leader asked, could one go on living calmly in a world where three quarters of the countries are fettered by debts they can never repay, while a small handful of states act as the omnipotent usurers?

"All men are mortal" is an axiom of elementary philosophy or, rather, formal logic. The danger of our time consists in the fact that the life span of everyone of us might be cut short simultaneously, in other words, all mankind could be destroyed in a matter of hours or days in a nuclear holocaust.

As Mikhail Gorbachev said in his address to the forum, "man has always searched for the elixir of life. Each of us finds it hard to resign himself to his personal mortality. But it is impossible to resign ourselves to the idea of mankind and human intelligence being finite." It was not just a philosophical idea, but a matter of telling mankind the truth about what it is facing at the present time. "The 'nuclear safeguard' is neither foolproof nor everlasting," he said. "It can at any moment become a death sentence for mankind. The more nuclear weapons there are, the less chance there is of their 'obedient behaviour.'"

As if in a third-rate film script, President Reagan got the idea of carrying war from Earth to outer space. This was brought up at a discussion in the Cosmos Hotel. In the absence of an agreement that would save the galaxy from nuclear annihilation, the President has proposed concluding an American-Soviet agreement jointly to repulse an invasion from other planets...

I must admit that the Cosmos Hotel is so vast that one can easily get lost

in the labyrinth of its corridors. That is how I chanced on a round-table meeting to which I clearly did not belong. Somewhat bewildered at first, I gradually caught on to the subject of the discussion. An Argentinian scientist had the floor. After that, Academician Andrei Sakharov was announced, and I realized that it was not a meeting of actors and writers. I listened with interest and respect to his brief communication.

A wide variety of opinions was voiced at the forum in quest of a key to the survival of humanity through the medium of dialogue. During an intermission, I caught hold of Ariadne's thread in an effort to find my way in the labyrinth. I took the escalator to the second floor and at last found the crowded hall in which the session I searched for was in session. Graham Greene was winding up his speech. He spoke, like everyone else, without notes, and with his usual English humour. He was followed by the American writer Norman Mailer. The keynote of the forum was the need to create a new peace mentality to counteract the arms race which, he said, was a negation of human reason and being. The author of "Naked and the Dead" and "The Executioner's Song" urged the need to "change the stage props," i.e., to change the image of the Soviet Union created in the United States not without the help of all manner of individuals vested with enormous power to make decisions.

It is, of course, hard to forget that it was Reagan who called the U.S.S.R. "the empire of evil." While rehearsing one of his radio speeches, he said, whether in earnest or in jest, that in five minutes he would order the war against the Soviet Union to begin.

In the United States there is a machinery for implanting fear. Not long ago I read an article in the International Herald Tribune by John Mack, director of the Centre for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age. It was about something that is being widely discussed in America, in the U.S.S.R. and the world generally—the TV serial "Amerika" which depicts the United States in 1997, "ten years after the Soviet invasion." This insane but extremely intriguing subject set the American scientist pondering on the responsibility of the mass media in the nuclear age.

Norman Mailer spoke of the outrageous stereotypes designed to breed

fear and hatred of other nations, and to accustom people to the idea that one day the button will have to be pressed in order to prevent what is shown in the film from happening. New scenario is indeed badly needed. And so are scenarios for a secure world so as to avoid the ultimate catastrophe. The American novelist added that he had come to the forum prompted by the conviction that Gorbachev's proposals offered great opportunities for hindering the death merchants from carrying their plans to completion. Mailer does not want a nuclear collision. He believes it will be possible to avoid a fatal end.

Another well-known American writer, Gore Vidal, recalled that Reagan in his Hollywood days played the part of a CIA agent several times. One of his characters spoke about installing a stabilizer of terrestrial gravitation. We have been hearing the same story for fifty years, Vidal added. He said that Mikhail Gorbachev reminded him of his boyhood hero, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Thus, the most diverse opinions were voiced at the Cosmos Hotel. People here spoke freely about everything. The atmosphere was one of both wild flights of fancy and the most down-to-earth reality. The sceptics, of course, might have regarded the final speech of the Soviet leader as fantasy. For he again urged that the next century be ushered in without nuclear weapons, and this means that in the remaining 13 or 14 years we have to pave the way to universal disarmament. To beat swords into ploughshares has been man's dream through the centuries. Today it is a matter not of swords or of David's slingshot, or even of Don Quixote's pike, but of the nuclear bomb. Today we are faced with the choice between the elimination of nuclear weapons and the destruction of all mankind. The Moscow forum opted for the former. This is only the initial step. A thousand more steps must be taken throughout the world. There must be a dialogue between individuals, peoples and countries. The scenario of hate must be changed for one of peace.

/9274

CSO: 1812/96

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

MUNICH CONFERENCE SCENE OF DISCORD OVER U.S.-SOVIET TALKS

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 3 Feb 87 p 12

[Article by Ernst-Otto Maetzsche: "The Situation Has Become More Serious--An Occasional Ruckus at the Wehrkunde Conference in Munich"]

[Text] Two events of the past year determined the arguments and climate of this year's Wehrkunde conference: The meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev in Reykjavik and the American November elections with the resulting close, but perceptible balance in favor of the Democrat Party in the Senate. Presumably because of the first event, more defense ministers than ever before came to Munich, and certainly because of the second, the American participants were much more belligerent than is the norm for these conferences. It did not help that the NATO General Secretary Carrington as well as the European NATO Supreme Commander Rogers distinguished themselves by their absence: Carrington's predecessor, Luns, did indeed occasionally doze off, but when awakened, he always found the fitting, appropriate word. This was missing this time.

The new American Senate majority has much less understanding for the [NATO] alliance than the old majority and the Administration did, even though the European allies occasionally complained about their point of view, too. President Carter's former National Security Advisor, Brzezinski, threw out the catch-phrase "100,000 men" to the new one: the armed forces stationed in Europe can and must be thinned out by that much so that the American instrument of defense would be stronger where it is needed the most, for example in the Middle East. There is no chance for the counter-argument that the relative peace and security in Central Europe depends on the current available strength of the NATO armed forces. Apparently the American Senate also doesn't recall how pathetically a similar troop-reduction plan ended in South Korea during the Carter presidency. The plan to nibble away at the reinforced division stationed there did not work. The only good thing was that they backed off from the attempt before greater damage was done.

It was interesting how the Social Democrat disarmaments expert Bahr addressed the "100,000 man" theme. It seemed "foolish" indeed to him to begin troop pullouts on the eve of negotiations, but he did not see any danger in that. With a sarcastic voice, he stated, "if I tremble, I must make up for the two (pulled out) divisions. If I don't tremble, then I don't feel endangered."

West German Defense Minister Woerner sounded different as he spelled out the certain results of a troop reduction: the concept of forward defense would no longer be possible. That doesn't concern Bahr, for whom an almost completely demilitarized 300 km corridor between NATO and the Warsaw Pact would be enough security. This is even though the name "corridor" already has "bad press in European history," as a French participant pointedly noted.

The most alarming thing was that American participants defended the troop pullout not so much with security policy but much more with internal political and foreign trade arguments. Suddenly the European agricultural market was the subject, the closing of which supposedly drove 200,000 American farmers out of business. According to the new American train of thought, if the Common Market would end agricultural subsidies and overproduction, then there would be a lot of money available for sufficient conventional armaments. The same went for the European space and telecommunications industry. Indeed, the former "Chicken War" has occasionally played a roll in earlier Wehrkunde conferences, but it all sounds rougher now. Apparently the American government will no longer refrain from these tendencies. Their ambassador in Bonn, Burt, who is inclined to exaggerate anyway, saw economics and trade closely related to security policy and also saw that the economic course of the Common Market endangered the alliance's ability to defend itself. It did not help any when Woerner declared that the weakening of the alliance being due to economic grounds was "absurd," or when he justified the promotion of the European aviation industry on the grounds of avoiding letting Europe become strictly a license-manufacturer of American advanced technology. Accusations from across the Atlantic are growing, and rhetoric within the alliance is becoming more inflammatory. More revealing were American administration complaints that the European allies gave them little political support when it came to East-West matters. Undersecretary Perle related a number of examples in a provocative and caustic manner to show that the Europeans in the alliance always took the Russian side. Every American disarmament proposal, especially when it concerned reliable treaty verification, was immediately watered down to make it more appealing to the Soviet Union. The allies also always shy away from backing up American complaints, when appropriate, about continuous Soviet cheating.

All of that was correct, and it led to sober and self-criticizing consideration despite Perle's overly sharp manner. Public opinion in the European partner states is strongly influenced by the fact that in discussions on national defense, many things are never mentioned by name. It was above all the participants from France who managed to plainly say where it would lead to in the end: first to shocking phrases which pretend the totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe are an economic community--"a common house" and other things--and finally to a frame of mind which is no longer prepared to sacrifice young people, "while the Russians could send hundreds of thousands to death." The French proved to be the staunchest. Could that have anything to do with their possession of atomic weapons?

Ever since the meeting in Reykjavik, it has been remarked all over Europe that the old disarmament rhetoric about the "Zero Option" and a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests cannot be used as thoughtlessly as before. It could be stated in Munich without contradiction that atomic weapons cannot be

eliminated from the face of the earth: the clock cannot be turned back. The number of these weapons could be greatly reduced, but a few should remain because otherwise it would be too easy for them to be made somewhere else. In addition, a Zero Option for medium-range weapons in Europe would be a questionable peace guarantee if Soviet short-range missiles insured that there was nothing to stop a conventional attack by the Warsaw pact other than a conventional defense which was inferior from the start. But how to get out from under the Zero Option now? The CDU Presidium Member Kiep does not see any way out. "The concept was introduced in a national election and it cannot be abandoned without a loss of trust." The Bavarian Minister President Strauss sees it differently. He would prefer to just leave 100 medium-range missiles on each side at first: If the Russians want to attain their goal of making any threat to their country impossible, they should have to accept an entire package--the short-range missiles would have to be eliminated, too.

It was clear in Munich how far the Europeans--with only the intent of gaining votes--have run with disarmament possibilities which were not thought out. They were advised by the American side to be more careful with that in the future so as not to force the alliance's predominant power to accept poorly-founded proposals and ideas. They occasionally admitted in Munich in self-criticism that they are partially guilty for not being consulted as much as before (by the Americans). In fact, their security was not considered enough in Reykjavik. So much so that a French participant used the alarm word "Yalta." The situation has become more serious, and the Wehrkunde conference proved it as none of its predecessors has.

13071

CSO: 3620/139

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

CANADA: TORONTO STAR ON OPPORTUNITY FOR ARMS CONTROL PACT

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 3 Mar 87 p A16

[Text]

For External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, the timing couldn't be better. President Ronald Reagan's arms control adviser, Paul Nitze, is in Ottawa today to explain why his boss is so gung-ho on Star Wars that he's prepared to break the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty. Clark is primed to explain why the Canadian government thinks that is a bad idea.

At the same time, Clark could tell Nitze that Canada wants the U.S. to accept Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's latest arms-control proposal. In a surprise announcement on the weekend, Gorbachev offered to negotiate the withdrawal by both sides of their medium-range nuclear weapons from Europe. And he no longer ties this to an agreement by the U.S. to limit Star Wars research to the laboratory, as he did when he met Reagan at Reykjavik last October.

In a public statement, Clark has already urged the Soviet Union and the United States to negotiate. "Canada has actively supported the idea that an intermediate nuclear forces agreement should not depend on agreement being reached on strategic (long-range) arms or on defensive systems," Clark said on Sunday.

Gorbachev's initiative puts both the Reagan administration and Western Europe to the test. Initial reaction from European leaders, who have often been ambivalent about the prospect of arms-control agreements that would remove the American nuclear umbrella and leave Western Europe to fend for itself against conventional Soviet forces, has been positive. And in the U.S., assistant defence secretary Richard Perle, a leading hawk, called the proposal "a constructive step that should open the way to concluding remaining issues leading ultimately to a treaty." At the same time, however, retiring NATO commander Gen. Bernard Rogers suggested the West would be "mad" to conclude a separate agreement on intermediate missiles.

One stumbling block, identified by Washington officials, is the need for a system of verifying that both sides are observing any treaty's terms. Here's where Canada can help; we have acquired some expertise in verification by spending \$1 million a year on research.

An arms-control treaty — conceivably to be signed at a Washington summit between Reagan and Gorbachev — may be just what Reagan needs to regain his credibility as a world leader.

/9317
CSO: 5220/37

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

INDIAN DEFENSE EXPERT WRITES ON NEW U.S. NUCLEAR TEST

Madras THE HINDU in English 11 Feb 87 p 8

[Article by C. Raja Mohan, Institute for Defense Studies and Analyses]

[Text]

THE American nuclear shot that rang out from Nevada on February 3 is yet another blow against nuclear arms limitation from the Reagan Administration. Eighteen months of "nuclear silence" observed by Moscow has failed to move Washington. Nor has the demand of the peace movements worldwide, including the six-nation initiative (The Delhi Six) to end the testing of nuclear weapons once and for all had any impact on the White House. The American refusal to heed the demands is only a part of the wider unravelling of the optimistic gloss that was put over an essentially tragic failure of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit at Reykjavik last October.

The visions of a nuclear-free world that emerged at Reykjavik are dissolving as a series of regrettable steps are unveiled by the Reagan Administration. In the days after Reykjavik, it quickly became evident that the failure there went much deeper than the inability of the U.S. President, Mr. Ronald Reagan, and the Soviet General Secretary, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, to come to terms with the future of the Star Wars programme. The received wisdom on Reykjavik that the summit unhinged on Star Wars was soon belied by Mr. Reagan's retreat from the Reykjavik proposals.

In the first step backward, Mr. Reagan declared that he did not agree to the elimination of all nuclear weapons, but only that of ballistic missiles. The Russians threatened to release the agreed minutes of the summit proving him wrong on that count, but the threat was irrelevant. In fact all the major European allies of the U.S. and a large section of American strategic community and media attacked Mr. Reagan for being tempted by the idea of a nuclear-free world. Nor was the U.S. military brass too enamoured of a world free from nuclear weapons. It is one thing for Mr. Reagan to justify Star Wars in the name of making nuclear weapons

"obsolete." It is another to seek their elimination. The basic dogma of American strategic thinking—that nuclear weapons are the *sine qua non* of peace and security—asserted itself with such ferociousness that it forced Mr. Reagan to backtrack from supporting the "fanciful," "unrealistic" and "deceptive" proposals of Mr. Gorbachev, who dares to dream about a nuclear-free world.

The fear of a non-nuclear future was even more alarming to the West European leaders, brought up on the myth that American nuclear weapons based in Europe are the sole guarantors of European security. After years of publicly endorsing the zero option of Mr. Reagan—which called for removing both American and Soviet nuclear weapons from Europe—the West European leaders panicked after Reykjavik. Mr. Gorbachev was threatening West Europe by accepting what the West Europeans themselves had proposed: the zero option! So the sterile arguments on Soviet "conventional military superiority" in a non-nuclear world were dusted up by Messrs Thatcher, Mitterrand and Kohl to block any possible agreement to remove U.S. nuclear missiles from Europe. That the Soviet Union offered last June to enforce deep cuts in conventional forces in Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals—was however no consolation. The "danger" of a non-nuclear Europe had to be averted by exerting a "restraining" influence on Mr. Reagan.

Overstepping limits

Thus ironically, the Reykjavik summit's promise of a nuclear-free world led to the reaffirmation of the cult of nuclear weapons. It has demonstrated that while the USSR was prepared to eliminate nuclear weapons, the consensus in North America and West Europe was for retaining them.

In a second move, Mr. Reagan demonstrated the resolve not only to retain nuclear

weapons but to multiply them. Undeterred by the Langate scandal, he ordered the expansion of the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal beyond the limits imposed by the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-II). The treaty signed by the U.S. and the USSR was never ratified by the U.S., but both sides agreed to abide by its limits. By overstepping the SALT-II limits, Mr. Reagan was destroying the only Soviet-American agreement in place to limit offensive nuclear weapons. The door to an unlimited race in offensive nuclear weapons was thus thrown open by Mr. Reagan so soon after tantalising the world with nuclear abolition at Reykjavik. The breakout from SALT was undertaken with utter disregard for the sentiments of U.S. Congress which in a non-binding resolution last year urged the Reagan Administration to abide by the SALT-II ceilings on the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Without the SALT ceilings, the current Soviet and American strategic nuclear arsenals at the level of about 10,000 to 11,000 warheads each would expand to about 25,000 to 30,000 warheads each by 1994.

In a third step, the SALT-II decision is now followed by the move to press ahead with nuclear testing in 1987 in spite of the appeals from the world over—including the U.S. Congress and important sections of the American scientific community—to stop testing nuclear weapons and negotiate a comprehensive test ban with the Soviet Union. The Soviet good faith on achieving a complete halt to all nuclear weapons tests was demonstrated not only by the 18-month-old unilateral moratorium, but also by a major concession in allowing on-site inspection effectively to verify a comprehensive nuclear test ban. It has agreed to the third party verification proposed by the Delhi Six. It has also allowed a non-governmental American scientific group to set up nuclear test monitoring facilities in the Soviet Union.

Ready for compromise

The U.S. now makes it pretty clear a nuclear test ban is only a very long-term goal, and it would like to test nuclear weapons so long as its security is dependent on nuclear weapons. Since Reykjavik it has been evident that the U.S. policy has no intention of doing away with nuclear weapons, and it is unlikely to give up testing either. The immediate motivation for continued testing rests on the hopes of developing a new generation of nuclear weapons some of which would play a central role in the Star Wars programme. Thus the testing issue is critically related to the Reagan Administration's visions of space weapons development.

The Soviet Union appears prepared for a compromise on the question of ending nuclear weapons tests. It is agreeable to an American proposal to a step-by-step reduction of nuclear tests provided the U.S. is willing to open full-scale talks leading to an early conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The Reagan Administration has no interest in a CTBT, but is only willing to talk about improving verification of a

limited test ban agreement. The USSR thus appears to have no option but to resume its nuclear testing in the near future, if not immediately.

In a probable final death blow to the Soviet-American arms limitation process, the hawks in the Reagan Administration led by the Defence Secretary, Mr. Caspar Weinberger, have begun the push for early deployment of a partial SDI system by the early 1990s. Claiming enormous progress in SDI research over the last three years, the champions of the SDI are demanding that the research programme be converted into a development and deployment phase. It is reported in the U.S. media that Mr. Reagan is amenable to the idea.

Since Mr. Reagan stunned the world with his "Star Wars" speech on March 23, 1983, the U.S. has claimed that the SDI is a research programme. The declared strategy so far has been that after a period of robust research into the feasibility of SDI technologies, a decision in the early 1990s would be taken on the development and deployment of the SDI. But now the conservatives are seeking rapidly to alter this scenario by demanding a deployment decision right now.

Observers, while being sceptical of the claimed advances in the SDI, discern two motives for the new move by the SDI proponents. The conservatives believe that a purely research programme is unlikely to get sustained support for years to come. They would prefer an early procurement decision that would build a lasting constituency for the programme. Mr. Weinberger himself is on record suggesting that such a decision would help prevent the next Administration, due in 1989, from backing away from a lasting commitment to the SDI. Secondly the conservatives drew a lesson from Reykjavik that if the SDI remains a research programme, there is always the temptation for a "grand compromise" on arms control. They fear that as long as the ABM Treaty of 1972, which restricts the SDI severely, is in place, Mr. Gorbachev would press with an offer that would be utterly difficult to refuse: allow considerable research and testing of the SDI in return for an agreement on deep cuts in nuclear arsenals. With their visceral hostility towards arms control, the conservatives would like to destroy the ABM Treaty, which would be if SDI development and deployment are undertaken to avoid any compromise agreement around the ABM Treaty on the vexing Star Wars question.

A high price

The only silver lining in this gloomy arms control cloud is that there is bound to be significant opposition within the U.S. to such an early SDI deployment decision. In an era of overwhelming budget deficits and fiscal restraint the price tag for a quick SDI—at more than \$100,000 millions—could be too high to be squeezed out of Congress. Some senior military officials too believe that a large SDI budget would cut into the more important and tangible conventional weapons procurement. The arms control

lobbyists too would prefer to use the SDI as a bargaining chip to work out an arms control agreement with the USSR. But it remains to be seen whether these forces can prevent an early commitment to the SDI by the U.S. The record is not inspiring. The conservatives have so far won every major battle within the U.S. policymaking arena on arms and arms control.

If they win again or even force a draw, it would be tragic. A race in both offensive nuclear weapons and the defensive Star War weapons would begin in earnest making the world a far more dangerous place than it is today. If ever the history of that world gets written, Reykjavik would only be a brief footnote.

/9274

CSO: 5250/0008

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET PREMIER RECEIVES SWEDISH DELEGATION

LD061229 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 6 Mar 87

[Text] Moscow March 6 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., today received a special envoy of Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson of Sweden, Pierre Schori, secretary-general of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, who conveyed to him a message from the head of the Swedish Government.

Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed gratitude for the message which the Soviet side regards as fresh proof of the development of the practice of direct dialogue in different forms between the leadership of Sweden and the Soviet Union -- the practice which received a new impetus as a result of Ingvar Carlsson's official visit to Moscow last year.

During the meeting Nikolay Ryzhkov drew special attention of the Swedish side to the new Soviet initiative aiming for the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe -- the initiative that embodied a new way of thinking of the Soviet leadership on security and disarmament matters and a sense of lofty responsibility for the search for ways to resolve the problem of nuclear arms reduction and their subsequent elimination.

The hope was expressed that the situation taking shape at present would be seriously considered in Europe and that the unique possibility would be used to ensure that the European Continent would no longer be regarded as a potential theater of a nuclear war. In that context a positive appraisal of that major Soviet step by the prime minister of Sweden was met with satisfaction in the U.S.S.R.

Nikolay Ryzhkov and Pierre Schori considered certain matters of mutual interest related to Soviet-Swedish relations in the spirit of mutual understanding and trust. Nikolay Ryzhkov reaffirmed the Soviet Union's unswerving line toward the development of goodneighborly Soviet-Swedish relations for the good of the peoples of both countries, for the benefit of European and universal peace.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1352

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

UK'S THATCHER, HOWE WELCOME GORBACHEV ARMS PROPOSAL

London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1230 GMT 2 Mar 87

[By chief political correspondent Chris Moncrieff]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher is greeting the new arms cuts proposals of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev with "cautious optimism," Whitehall sources said today.

After studying the "broad thrust" Soviet offer, she said to welcome the proposals "subject to satisfactory arrangements being made over other and related aspects of disarmament."

Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe welcomed the Soviet statement as an "eloquent testimony to the firmness and resolve of the alliance."

The surprise offer from Mr Gorbachev, which could mean the disappearance of U.S. cruise missiles from British and other Western European sites, received a warmer welcome from other political parties. SDP [Social Democratic Party] leader Dr David Owen described it as a "big step towards a stable and peaceful world." Labour Defence spokesman Mr Denzil Davies said the way was open for the "speedy removal" of cruise missiles from Britain.

The Whitehall sources dismissed suggestions that Mr Gorbachev's offer on medium-range missiles had deprived Mrs Thatcher of achieving a political coup in her historic visit to Moscow later this month. But they confirmed that she had written to the Soviet leader after meeting President Reagan at Camp David last November.

At Camp David, the two Western leaders identified an intermediate range (INF) [intermediate-range nuclear forces] agreement with restraints on shorter range systems as a priority.

The sources said Britain also welcomed the fact that the Kremlin now appeared to have dropped its insistence on a link with the U.S. "Star Wars" programme in any agreement.

The government believes Western firmness and resolve over a nuclear deterrent played a part in the emergence of the Soviet proposals.

But Britain and the U.S. will insist that effective verification of any dismantling of nuclear weapons is essential. They will also

want an elimination of the disparity between the West and the Soviet bloc in conventional weapons.

According to the sources, the West will further insist on a firm Soviet commitment in negotiations to correct what is regarded as a huge imbalance, in the Soviet's favour, in shorter-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

When Mrs Thatcher meets Mr Gorbachev in the Kremlin this month her aim will be to move matters forward although there will be no question of her assuming the role of an honest broker.

Dr Owen, speaking in Truro, Cornwall, said: "This offer shows that when the Soviet Union adopts an unreasonable position the West has to keep its nerve." He added: "This is a big step towards a stable and peaceful world and I believe a deal can be signed by the end of the summer."

Any agreement leading to the removal of cruise from Britain would mean that the Greenham Common air-base in Berkshire would revert to stand-by status and work on the Molesworth site in Cambridgeshire would stop. The 96 missiles at Greenham would be removed to America and the 88 due to arrive at Molesworth next year would never cross the Atlantic.

Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe gave three reasons for welcoming the Soviet statement which he described as "eloquent testimony to the firmness and resolve of the alliance."

He said: "First, it accepts the idea of an INF agreement based on the zero-option which the alliance first put forward some six years ago. The Western approach over many months in Geneva, and the 1983 decisions to deploy cruise and Pershing II have been justified.

"Second, the Soviet leadership appears to have broken the link between the INF Agreement and the Strategic Defence Initiative (Star Wars), something which Britain and her allies have repeatedly urged on the Soviet Union.

"Third, the Soviet statement makes no reference to the British and French independent nuclear deterrents. And the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman appeared to confirm earlier today that our long insistence on the exclusion of the British and French deterrents was justified."

Sir Geoffrey said: "The Soviet statement is therefore eloquent testimony to the firmness and resolve of the alliance. We shall need to look carefully at the fine print. Verification and arrangements for shorter-range INF remain particularly crucial.

"This task, in the first place, will be for the U.S. and Soviet negotiators at the Geneva talks. But Britain will play its part in talks with the Russians, including during the prime minister's visit to Moscow later this month."

He added: "In their agreement last November, the prime minister and President Reagan identified an INF Agreement as one of the top priorities for arms control. Its achievement could transform for the better the whole atmosphere in which arms control talks and relations between East and West are conducted."

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADIAN REACTION TO GORBACHEV ARMS REDUCTION PROPOSAL

Clark Remarks

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 3 Mar 87 p A8

[Text]

OTTAWA

The Canadian Government said yesterday that it welcomes the possibility of a breakthrough in nuclear arms control for Europe, but Ottawa will not commit itself yet to ending cruise-missile testing.

The New Democratic Party's foreign affairs critic, Pauline Jewett, asked External Affairs Minister Joe Clark in the Commons yesterday whether Canada would end U.S. cruise-missile test flights in Canada because of the latest developments in arms-control discussions between Moscow and Washington.

Mr. Clark said that the proposition was still hypothetical and that the federal Government will await concrete results from Geneva to determine what Ottawa's own position will be on the cruise-missile issue.

The previous Liberal government linked its approval for cruise tests in the Canadian Arctic to the question of nuclear missiles in Europe. Former prime minister Pierre Trudeau said Canada's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization made it Ottawa's duty to test cruise missiles in the same way European NATO countries were

obliged to allow deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on their territory.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said on Saturday that Moscow was willing to sign an agreement with Washington to eliminate U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles within five years.

Mr. Clark told Ms Jewett that while Ottawa welcomes the developments, all that has happened so far is that "discussions that appeared to be closed have now been opened. We will determine Canadian Government policy on the basis of what is actually decided in Geneva."

In a separate communiqué released yesterday, Mr. Clark said Mr. Gorbachev's proposals are a positive development but warned that agreement is far from assured. He said Canada also believes Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Reagan should have another summit to discuss arms control.

The latest series of tests in Canada ended on Sunday with a missile landing on target at a weapons range in northern Alberta after a four-hour flight from its launch by a U.S. Air Force B-52 bomber over the Beaufort Sea.

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 3 Mar 87 p A19

[Article by Richard Gwyn]

[Text]

LONDON — Almost certainly, there will not be an medium-range missile, whether a Pershing II or a cruise or a Soviet SS-20, left in Europe by the early 1990s.

The deal isn't quite in the bag. Some delicate knots have still to be tied, on such things as verification and timing. But Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev has just about placed the deal in the bag with his dramatic policy turnaround.

Just why Gorbachev abandoned his insistence on a prior deal on the Strategic Defence Initiative — U.S. research into the so-called Star Wars anti-missile defence system — doesn't really matter.

The familiar explanations can be trotted out:

□ Gorbachev needs a foreign policy success to maintain the momentum of his *perestroika* — reconstruction;

□ He has to quickly divert money from swords to ploughshares and computers;

□ He has decided not to wait the three years or so he would otherwise have to, until a new American president has established himself.

Similarly, it would be stale and trite now to speculate whether Gorbachev's motive is to capitalize on President Ronald Reagan's current weakness brought about the damning report on the Iran hostages-for-arms swap.

Instead, just one fact matters: Gorbachev has done it.

Sufficient trust

Because he has done it, almost anything now becomes possible: A major cut in long-range (intercontinental) missiles that would free both superpowers from their fear of a surprise attack; elimination of chemical weapons; phasing out of nuclear tests, and a pact to reduce conventional forces.

Much more may yet be done. An acceptable Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, for instance, and, no less so, a U.S. pullout from Central America.

The catalytic new ingredient Gorbachev has added to East-West relations is that of trust.

He has trusted the West enough to do a policy flip-flop and to make an offer that requires him to cut about 920 nuclear warheads in Europe compared to 572 — not all of them yet deployed — by the United States.

Trust, if it is reciprocated, reinforces itself. So all the other deals become possible, no matter what the advantage or to which side. Eventually, we may achieve with the Soviet Union the kind of normalcy (itself once unimaginable) that now exists between the West and China.

The '80s have so far been a pretty cruddy decade. It may end up as one of the most creative of decades since World War II.

Some of the credit for this must go to Reagan, although it's unfashionable these days to give him credit for anything. His policy of bargaining from strength has paid off (whether it would have, without a Gorbachev to bargain with, is another matter).

What Reagan did at Reykjavik may turn out to compensate for all his blunders in the Iran arms scandal. In the Icelandic capital, for the first time, a president seriously discussed massive arms cuts rather than the arms limitation pacts of the past that aimed merely to manage the arms race.

Reagan could do this, as no predecessor could, because, such being the irony of politics, he had established his unimpeachable anti-Soviet credentials.

But it's Gorbachev who really matters. He's the man of the '80s

who will have more impact upon our lives than any other leader in any other country — unless something goes needlessly and tragically wrong.

Western European leaders have publicly praised Gorbachev. But privately, many are uneasy. They worry that if the Euromissiles go, the United States thereafter will withdraw gradually from Europe. They worry more that if Europe becomes de-nuclearized and demilitarized, the justification for keeping the two Germanies apart will vanish.

No one should doubt that fear of a strong Germany goes much deeper in Europe than does fear of a strong Soviet Union.

Give Soviets edge

Hence all the quibbling that will soon break the surface here about the Euromissile deal — that it will leave the Soviets with an advantage in short-range missiles; that Europe will be left in the shadow of

the Red Army's conventional superiority, and so on.

There's more to worry about in Washington because that's where the power lies (in normal times, anyway). Hawks such as Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger are frantically trying to make Star Wars unstoppable by convincing Reagan to approve deployment of an early "mini" system.

Weinberger's case — the same as Reagan's at Reykjavik — is that the Strategic Defence Initiative is necessary because the Soviets cannot be trusted. But, unless they can be trusted, no arms deal of any kind is possible anyway.

To get the Euromissile deal completely into the bag thus will take some adroit tugging and shoving.

Canada could apply a bit of this muscle. Our military contingent in West Germany, although more symbolic than substantive, gives us a claim to be heard in any council called to shape a de-militarized Europe.

Disarmament Ambassador Roche

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 4 Mar 87 p A4

[Article by Ron Lowman]

[Text]

Canada's disarmament ambassador Douglas Roche is delighted with Soviet proposals to limit medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, but he's not "jumping up and down yet."

"The highs and lows are so destabilizing. Only steady, consistent progress can get results," Roche said in a telephone interview from his external affairs department office in Ottawa.

He said Canada would keep pushing the two superpowers for a real agreement. But everything depends on how badly the Soviet administration of Mikhail Gorbachev and the United States administration of President Ronald Reagan want it.

One fly in the ointment, Roche said, is the attitude of Western European governments, which don't want the Intermediate-range Nuclear Force removed because they have come to regard it as their "comfort zone."

What Gorbachev is proposing is a plan that almost came to fruition last October at his summit meeting with Reagan in Reykjavik, Iceland. Under it, the number of intermediate, or medium-range, nuclear warheads would be limited to 100 on each side.

The Soviet's 100 would be located in the Asian part of the country.

Roche said the Gorbachev proposal is overdue and is to be welcomed.

Space based

He said that in a meeting with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh in Moscow in December, and in lectures he gave at the U.S.-Canada Institute in Moscow and the International Academy in Kiev, he emphasized Canada's stance that an agreement on medium-range missiles should be separate from any consideration of the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, more popularly known as Star Wars.

Such a system, if it ever proves feasible, would employ space and earth-based lasers, mirrors, particle beams and kinetic energy created by a projectile moving

at high speed to destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

Star Wars has worried the Soviet Union's leaders, who are apparently afraid it will render the ICBM obsolete and thus destroy the East-West balance. The Russians already have an anti-ballistic missile system spread like an umbrella over Moscow.

Until Gorbachev's latest offer, the Kremlin had linked a medium-range missile ban to a demand that the U.S. limit its testing on Star Wars.

Roche said he hopes Gorbachev will include short-range, or battlefield, nuclear weapons in any agreement reached.

/9317

CSO: 5220/33

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT REACTS 'POSITIVELY' TO GORBACHEV PROPOSAL

PM101619 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 2 Mar 87 p 1

[Correspondent's report: "Van Eekelen: Chance That Deployment Need Not Take Place is Growing"]

[Text] The Hague, 2 Mar — Defense Minister Van Eekelen sees a greater chance that the 48 cruise missiles destined for the Netherlands will not be deployed in Woensdrecht in 1988. He said this in a reaction to Soviet leader Gorbachev's disarmament proposal.

The Netherlands Government also reacted positively to the Soviet leader's willingness to reach a separate agreement on intermediate-range missiles. But it first wants to know more details about verification and about short-range missiles before it reaches a final decision.

Yesterday the peace movement immediately called for an end to the work being carried out at the Woensdrecht Air Base, but Van Eekelen cannot find any good reason for such a step. The Netherlands will only carry out its part of an agreement once the Soviet side has carried out its part, Van Eekelen said.

Foreign Minister Van den Broek said this morning in New Delhi: "If we are really seeing a complete decoupling (of SDI from other weapons — editor) then this is a real gain and I have

high hopes of a real step forward." The minister also recalled here the linkage that the Soviet Union has made up to now with the French and British nuclear forces.

Second Chamber Deputy Frinking (Christian Democratic Appeal) said of the proposals: "Very promising. It looks as if all intermediate-range missiles could be withdrawn from Europe. If agreement is reached in Geneva we would be involved in making sure that the zero option would have real content." Up to now the Christian Democratic Appeal parliamentary group has adopted the position that an accord on intermediate-range missiles should not be linked to the problem of Russian superiority in the field of short-range missiles.

Den Uyl (Labor Party) called the proposals a breakthrough for which the whole of Europe has been waiting. According to Den Uyl the Netherlands Government can no longer have any objections and the NATO nations must get down to business with the Soviet Union as soon as possible.

Voorhoeve (People's Party for Freedom and Democracy) thinks that it is still too early to judge whether an agreement will lead to the withdrawal of all intermediate-range missiles. He considers the chances of an accord to have increased considerably.

/9274

CS0: 5200/2510

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CYPRIOI GOVERNMENT WELCOMES MISSILE PROPOSAL

NC051535 Nicosia Domestic Service in Greek 1500 GMT 5 Mar 87

[Text] The government spokesman has said the Cypriot Government welcomes with particular satisfaction the recent statement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev regarding eliminating intermediate-range missiles in Europe. This is a truly significant step which creates very real hopes that expectations following the Reykjavik summit can be realized.

/6091

CSO: 5200/2512

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA: CRUISE MISSILE TESTING DRAWS REACTION

Environmentalists, Group Coalition

Ottawa THE OTTAWA CITIZEN in English 23 Feb 87 pp A1, A2

[Text]

EDMONTON — A United States Air Force cruise missile will be tested over northern Canada Tuesday after two similar tests ended in failure last year, the Canadian government said Sunday.

Within hours of the announcement, environmentalists said they would try to scuttle the plan, and a coalition of church and labor groups said a public rally will be held outside the Alberta legislature on Tuesday to protest the move.

Small groups of Greenpeace protesters began assembling Sunday near the Cold Lake military base to plot strategy to disrupt Tuesday's test.

"We're going to be doing a traditional Greenpeace non-violent action," Greenpeace spokesman Beverly Pinnegar said. "We're fairly sure we can get the test delayed or canceled."

Two years ago Greenpeace tried to catch a cruise missile in a giant net, and last year tried to blockade the Cold Lake base. Both attempts failed.

Cruise critics argue the missiles, which can be armed with nuclear warheads, upset the arms balance through their ability to fly below enemy radar. The United States, which has deployed some 1,700 of the missiles on B-52 bombers, has tested a total of 75 in Utah and northern Canada. Eighteen have failed.

"Considering its poor track record, there is every reason to fear that the missile could fall on populated areas in Canada," Pinnegar said.

Harry Strynadka, spokesman for the Alberta Citizens' Anti-Cruise Committee, said the tests weaken Canadian sovereignty and endanger the lives of people in northern Canada.

"The tests also violate the terms of the strategic arms limitation treaty between the U.S. and the Soviet Union," he said in an interview. "These tests should not go on."

The committee's membership includes Project Ploughshares, the United Church and labor groups such as the Alberta Federation of Labor and the Chemical and Energy Workers Union.

The U.S. recently exceeded the limits of the SALT II treaty by deploying its 131st B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles without dismantling a nuclear-armed submarine.

The treaty, signed in 1979 but never ratified by the U.S., limits the development and deployment of nuclear warheads by the two superpowers.

The cruise tests — designed to gather targeting, guidance and flight data — are being conducted in northern Canada because the terrain is similar to that of the Soviet Union.

Canadian Forces Maj. Jan Martinsen said the unarmed air-launched missile will follow the same route as tests previously conducted under a 1983 Canada-U.S. agreement.

After being launched from a bomber over the Beaufort Sea, the missile will fly south for several hundred kilometres along the MacKenzie River Valley. It will then turn east to its final destination, the Primrose Lake weapons evaluation range in northeastern Alberta near Cold Lake, Alta.

In a telephone interview from CFB Cold Lake, Martinsen said the missile — designed to fly at low altitudes to evade enemy ra-

dar — can be stopped at any time and brought safely to earth by parachute.

"Safety will be the first concern" of the military during the test flight, which brings the missile no closer than 10 kilometres from any northern community, she said.

It is the first Canadian cruise test since two unsuccessful ones last year prompted the Canadian government to request a suspension of testing until technical problems were investigated.

Last January, a test missile ran out of fuel and landed off target at the weapons range. A second test the following month ended when a missile plunged to the ice-covered Beaufort Sea after being launched from a B-52 bomber.

External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said last October the technical questions raised by the two test failures have been resolved, but he gave no further details.

Under the agreement with the U.S. Air Force, Canada has allowed up to six tests a year of the air-launched cruise missiles using dummy warheads.

Martinsen said a U.S. AWACS (airborne warning and control system) surveillance aircraft will monitor the test route to ensure private and commercial aircraft do not stray into the area.

Arms Control, Disarmament Center

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 24 Feb 87 pp A1, A2

[Article by Andrew McIntosh]

[Text]

The Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament has urged the federal Government to suspend immediately the United States' cruise missile testing program in Canada.

The independent group had not previously opposed the tests but John Lamb, executive director, told reporters most Canadians would support the Conservative Government if it suspended the testing.

On the eve of today's cruise test to Cold Lake, Alta., Mr. Lamb said that the suspension would be justi-

fied because the Reagan Administration has dismantled the arms control framework under which tests have occurred in Canada since 1983.

Arms control has entered "a new and potentially terminal period of crisis," he said, as a result of the U.S. Administration's reported determination to reinterpret the provisions of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty to justify proceeding with its strategic defence initiative.

The arms control framework was further eroded, he added, by the

Reagan Administration's "unilateral abandonment" of the arms control provisions in the SALT II treaty with the Soviet Union.

John Barrett, deputy director of the policy institute, said these measures constitute grounds for the Government to suspend the tests because it agreed to them only assuming that the SALT II treaty would be in place and that the restrictive interpretation of the ABM treaty would be respected.

"The U.S. has unilaterally backed out of both of those positions and I would say that in a real sense that constitutes a breaking of the contract," Mr. Barrett said.

"It will be very difficult for the Canadian Government to argue that the U.S. Administration is serious about arms control and that it isn't, in fact, clearing the way for an all-out arms race."

A spokesman for External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said that Washington has yet to officially notify Ottawa that it has modified its interpretation of the ABM treaty and that today's cruise test will proceed.

While Mr. Lamb praised Mr. Clark for writing to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz this month to register Canada's preference for the traditional interpretation of the ABM treaty, he said the federal Government and other members of the NATO alliance must now stop giving the United States "the benefit of the doubt."

He said the "cavalier manner" in which the re-interpretation of the ABM treaty has been adopted by the U.S. Administration, despite opposition in Congress and with limited consultation with NATO allies, suggests President Ronald Reagan thinks he can "weather any allied objections."

Mr. Lamb said the Canadian Government could, in effect, "up the ante" by suspending the cruise tests.

Mr. Barrett said the suspension of cruise tests "until things are clarified along the lines of other Salt II and ABM treaties, is, I think, an option the Government can consider."

The policy institute's recommendation coincided with Liberal defence critic Douglas Frith's call for Ottawa to advise Washington now

that it will not renew the cruise testing agreement when it expires in 1988.

"Under the existing agreement, we are allowed, with 12 months notice, to indicate to the United States our intentions not to renew cruise missile testing," Mr. Frith said in an interview.

Although the Liberals supported cruise testing in the past — the agreement was signed by former Liberal prime minister Pierre Trudeau in 1983 — Mr. Frith said that circumstances have since changed and that the Liberal caucus will consider his policy next week when Parliament resumes sitting.

In Alberta yesterday, the environmental group Greenpeace said it would try to stop today's scheduled test flight of an unarmed cruise missile across northwestern Canada.

The test will be the seventh attempted since the 1983 agreement was signed. It will be the first since two unsuccessful flights last year prompted Ottawa to request a suspension of testing until technical problems were studied.

The cigar-shaped missile — about the length of a mid-size car — will be launched from a U.S. Air Force B-52 bomber over the frozen Beaufort Sea, 2,400 kilometres northwest of Edmonton.

Greenpeace members will be at Canadian Forces Base Cold Lake, where the flight is scheduled to end 4½ hours after its early-morning launch.

If all goes well, the \$2.3-million missile will make a parachute-assisted landing on the Primrose Lake air weapons range on the Alberta-Saskatchewan border, 290 kilometres northeast of Edmonton.

On Jan. 22, 1986, a cruise missile ran out of fuel and crashed a few kilometres short of the weapons range. A test about a month later ended moments after launch when the engine failed.

James Bohlen, a Greenpeace spokesman in Vancouver, said details of the protest action would be announced once the protest group is at the base.

Major Jan Martinson, a public affairs spokesman at CFB Cold Lake, said security at the base has been increased for the missile test.

Greenpeace, Other Groups

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 24 Feb 87 pp A1, A20

[Article by Dana Flavelle]

[Text]

Four members of Greenpeace infiltrated a restricted military zone near the Alberta-Saskatchewan border last night in a bid to disrupt or delay today's cruise missile test, a spokesman for the international environmental group says.

Three of the protesters were prepared to position themselves under the 3,000-pound missile as it landed today, Jim Bohlen told The Star in a telephone interview from Greenpeace headquarters in Vancouver last night.

"They are willing to allow it to hit them," said Bohlen, nuclear issues co-ordinator for Greenpeace.

The protesters slipped into the Primrose Weapons Evaluation Range late yesterday afternoon and were positioned about half a mile from where the unarmed cruise missile was to land, he said. The range is 290 kilometres (180 miles) northeast of Edmonton.

"We are prepared to risk our lives because the world is poised on the brink of nuclear war," protester Simon Waters told Canadian Press on his way to Primrose.

Two television crews from Edmonton stations accompanied the activists and two more protesters were to join them later.

The cylinder-shaped weapon, about the length of a mid-sized car, is to make a parachute-assisted landing between 2 and 4 p.m. Toronto time.

However, as part of the plan to disrupt the weapons test, Greenpeace planned to let the Canadian defence department know about their scheme last night.

"If the lives of those people are valued, they will cancel the tests," Bohlen said.

However, a spokesman on the Canadian Forces Base at Cold Lake, Alta., said the test was going ahead as scheduled.

Military police guarding the weapons range had been notified of the possible presence of civilians, Maj. Janet Martinsen told The Star.

The wooded testing range is large but the target site is in a clearing where the protesters could easily be spotted and removed, she said.

The protesters on site last night were Waters, Luanne Roth, Arne Hansen and Kevin McKewon. Two others, Peter Arahmowicz and Corie Dailey, had not yet joined them as of 8 p.m. All are from Edmonton or Vancouver and range in age between 32 and 39 years.

Temperatures were expected to drop to -15C overnight, Bohlen said. The protesters had taken with them snow shoes, freeze-dried food, foul weather gear and tents.

When asked what proof Greenpeace could offer that its members were indeed on the site, Toronto spokesman Steve Shallhorn said: "We're an international organization. We operate on the basis of carrying through what we say we'll do."

Meanwhile, dozens of other peace groups across Canada were also planning to hold demonstrations today to protest the U.S. Air Force test of a cruise missile in northern Canada.

In Edmonton, the Alberta Citizen's Anti-Cruise Committee planned to hold a protest rally outside the Legislature in Edmonton.

In Toronto, about a dozen members of ACT (Against Cruise Testing) for Disarmament were to demonstrate outside the U.S. Consulate on University Ave. at noon.

In Peterborough, high school students were to wear white arm bands signalling their opposition to the tests. The St. Catharines branch of ACT for Disarmament

planned to protest in front of city hall and the Kitchener-Waterloo chapter hoped to occupy Tory MP Walter McLean's office.

This year, for the first time, there will also be an international response in London and New York. European nuclear disarmament groups in England planned to blitz the Canadian embassy with phone calls protesting the tests. Details of a New York protest later in the week hadn't been completed yesterday.

"We've been talking with people across the country. Everyone is doing something," said Jennifer Ramsay, a co-ordinator of ACT's Toronto branch. "The issue is survival. The cruise missile defends no one. It is a weapon designed to enhance the destructive power of a first-strike by the American Air Force."

The protest is one of dozens planned across the country as peace groups scrambled to respond to Sunday's announcement that another cruise missile would be tested. Ramsay told a hastily called press conference at The Fallout Shelter, ACT's Spadina Ave. headquarters.

Canada's transport department gave all pilots the mandatory 48 hours' notice on Sunday that the missile would be launched from a B-52 bomber today.

The test is the first in Canada since two unsuccessful trials last year. A second test is planned before March 31.

The trials were halted last year after one missile ran out of fuel and crashed a few kilometres off target and the other plunged into the ice-covered Beaufort Sea. Altogether, six missiles have been tested since Canada signed a five-year agreement with the U.S. in 1983 which allows up to six tests a year.

Today's test was expected to go ahead as scheduled. Security at the Canadian Forces Base at Cold Lake had been tightened and "the weather looks good," spokesman Maj. Martinson said last night.

The cruise missile was to be flown into Canada by a B-52 from a U.S. Air Force base in Hlytheville, Ark., last night.

It was to be launched over the Beaufort Sea, 2,400 kilometres northwest of Edmonton, between 9.30 a.m. and 11.30 a.m., Toronto time.

If all went well, the cigar-shaped weapon would land at the Primrose Weapons Evaluation Range 4½ hours later.

Its flight will be monitored by an AWACS (airborne warning and control systems) plane and an ARIA (advanced range instrumentation aircraft).

Up to six Canadian CF-18 Hornet fighters from 410 Squadron and the Aerospace Engineering Technical Establishment at Cold Lake, as well as two U.S. Air Force F-16s and two F-4s will practise intercepts on the missile.

Canada is contributing to the arms buildup by allowing the U.S. to test a weapon that was used to break the SALT II (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) agreement, Greenpeace's Shalhorn said. The U.S. exceeded its weapons quota when it armed the 131st B-52 bomber with a cruise missile last November.

The Toronto chapter of ACT for Disarmament plans to hold a larger demonstration at noon Saturday in front of the federal Progressive Conservative party headquarters at 121 Richmond St. W.

"We're not expecting the 23,000 that showed up in 1983," Ramsay said. "I'd say 200 would be fine and 5,000 would be nice."

Activities During Test

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 25 Feb 87 pp A1, A2

[Text]

In the wake of the successful test of a cruise missile over the Beaufort Sea yesterday, and despite protests from anti-nuclear activists, a five-year agreement between Canada and the United States to test the controversial weapon will be renewed.

Bill Chambers, spokesman for External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, confirmed in Ottawa that the agreement will be automatically renewed for another five years.

Under terms of the 1983 defence co-operation pact, either country can give notice of 12 months that it intends to withdraw. The original agreement expires at the end of February, 1988, and unless Canada signals its intent to get out by Saturday, Feb. 28, the deal is automatically renewed.

Mr. Chambers said there are no plans to withdraw from the agreement.

Yesterday's test was the 75th trial of a cruise missile since it first flew in 1980.

Although there are no plans to pull Canada out of the general agreement that covers the cruise-testing program, Mr. Chambers said the pact allows either country to cancel if it finds that withdrawing is in its national interest.

"It's totally up to us, or to the Americans, to decide what is a national priority," he said.

Mr. Chambers' statement appears to be contradicted by wording in the actual agreement, which allows for withdrawal during the life of the agreement only in case of emergency, war, national insurrection or riot.

Individual tests can be cancelled, however, in the case of "unforeseen imperative circumstances."

"We're very upset about this," said Beverley Pinnegar of Greenpeace, the activist environmental group, from Vancouver. "This agreement should never have been signed in the first place."

The unarmed U.S. Air Force missile, launched yesterday morning from a B-52 bomber over the

Beaufort Sea, arrived on target and on schedule four hours later in northern Alberta.

Greenpeace attempts to disrupt the test as the unmanned projectile entered the recovery area at Primrose Lake Evaluation Range were unsuccessful, Canadian Forces Base Cold Lake commander David Kinsman said. The missile landed beside the lake, not on it, because of thin ice. There was minor damage to the tail.

On Monday, Greenpeace said as many as six of its members had illegally entered CFB Cold Lake. After the intruders camped overnight near the weapon evaluation range, Greenpeace said they planned to go to where the missile landed in the recovery area.

"We are still in the process of identifying whether any unauthorized people were on the base, but we are sure they were not in the recovery area proper," Colonel Kinsman said. Military police and RCMP officers from Cold Lake had made aerial and ground searches and had found no evidence of anything untoward, he said.

If any intruders were found on the 10,000-square-kilometre base they would have been detained, Col. Kinsman said, but he did not say whether they would be arrested.

Major Fred Harrop of Strategic Air Command headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., said yesterday at Cold Lake that the Greenpeace protest had had no effect upon any operational aspects of the mission.

Ms Pinnegar said the missile landed yesterday at the south-west edge of Primrose Lake. Greenpeace members on the base had reported that they were in place at the lake and would have been in a good position to film the missile's arrival, she said. Confirmation of this was being awaited.

For the first time in two years, the military described a U.S. Air Force cruise missile test in Canada as a complete success. Last winter, a missile came near its target on the Primrose Lake range, but ran

out of fuel and crashed. A few weeks later, another missile crashed on to ice in the Beaufort Sea when its engine failed to start.

"We're very pleased with the initial results of this test," Major Harrop said. "After the impression we gave last year, a lot of people (in Canada) began to doubt the validity of the program and its safety. I can't say how Canadians will perceive today's flight but we hope this will be a confidence booster. We feel very good about the missile. It works and it's operational."

"There is a need to continue testing the missile," Major Harrop said.

"Follow-on evaluation and upgrades to the system as a result of tests in the unique, cold and rugged terrain of Canada are needed. We've only had seven tests here so far and that does not make a full program."

The trial yesterday included monitoring of the missile by three surveillance aircraft and games of tag with 10 Canadian and U.S. fighters. Aircraft and staff from bases in Nova Scotia, Alberta and seven U.S. states were involved.

Outside the gates at CFB Cold Lake, three women from the Lakeland Coalition for Nuclear Awareness handed out loaves of bread and daffodils and calendars espousing the cause of world peace.

"I know the media are saying, 'What is this, three or four people protesting?' But it's not the number of people that's important," Wendy Tredger said. "A lot of people tell us they admire our bravery. They support us quietly."

One more test flight is scheduled in the next few weeks. Under the current agreement as many as six trials can be scheduled next winter.

Toronto Rally

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 25 Feb 87 p A4

[Article by Dana Flavelle]

[Text]

Sister Mary Alban, a 55-year-old Catholic nun, marches in cruise missile protests because she feels she must.

Like the other 25 people who carried placards and shouted slogans yesterday in front of the U.S. consulate on University Ave. yesterday, Alban can't sit back and watch it happen.

"I think we have to keep on acting, not only against the cruise," said Alban, who has written a book, *Peace is Possible*. "If our government wanted to, we could say no to that."

The small, orderly noon-hour protest was held to mark the seventh cruise missile test in Canada in four years. About 10 members of the Metro police force and Royal Canadian Mounted Police guarded the consulate during the rally but there were no unusual incidents or arrests.

Hastily called

The U.S. Air Force launched the cigar-shaped weapon from a B-52 bomber over the Beaufort sea early yesterday. The missile landed 4½ hours later near the Canadian Forces Base in Cold Lake, Alta.

The hastily called Toronto rally was one of several held across the country to protest Canada's growing participation in the arms race, said organizer Jennifer Ramsay of the peace group ACT for Disarmament.

A larger demonstration is planned for noon Saturday outside the federal Progressive Conservative Party headquarters on Richmond St. W.

"This isn't supposed to be a crowd event," Ramsay said of yesterday's demonstration. "I think we're raising people's con-

sciousness as to everything that Canada's getting involved in. Canada has been very deeply involved in the arms race."

A group from the Toronto board of education's experimental SEED Alternative School kicked off the protest with a bit of street theatre on the median that runs down the centre of University Ave.

The actors, some with faces painted deathly white, others wearing army caps or gas masks, played out a scene in which a cardboard cruise missile was killed with love. It lay draped in an American flag on the pavement.

Second Test Without Protests

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 2 Mar 87 p A3

[Text]

COLD LAKE, Alta. (CP) — After two postponements, the United States Air Force yesterday completed another successful test of the cruise missile.

The flight, the second within a week, ended when the unarmed missile landed by parachute on the sprawling Primrose Lake air-weapons range on the Alberta-Saskatchewan border.

The test — the final one of the year — came after bad weather in the U.S. grounded support planes Friday and Saturday. While the missile and the giant B-52 bomber that carries it could have flown, the surveillance aircraft that monitor the test were socked in.

Maj. Jan Martinsen, Canadian Forces spokesman at CFB Cold Lake, said the 4½-hour flight was on time and on target.

"The missile performed very, very well," she said.

Six Canadian CF-18 jet fighters

from Cold Lake intercepted the missile along its route in practice runs. Two of them tracked the cruise visually as it reached the end of the run.

Yesterday's test was conducted without the protests that accompanied previous flights.

Greenpeace had said it tried to disrupt Tuesday's tests. There were no signs of protesters around the military base yesterday.

On Saturday, about 125 protesters people gathered outside the U.S. consulate in Toronto.

The federal government announced last week that the agreement with the U.S. allowing the tests here will be extended for another five years.

The cruise missile, which is actually in service with the U.S. Air Force although testing continues, carries a sophisticated guidance system that allows it to hug the ground, making detection difficult.

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 3 Mar 87 p A12

[Text]

OTTAWA

Senior Liberals who have called for an end to cruise missile testing in Canada are not speaking on behalf of the party, Liberal Leader John Turner said yesterday.

"We'll have something to say when we have something to say," Mr. Turner told reporters, refusing to tip his hand on policy before he is ready.

He was commenting on a statement last week by Liberal defence critic Doug Frith that Ottawa should pull out of the 1983 agreement allowing the United States to test the missiles here.

But the words were no sooner out of Mr. Turner's mouth than Liberal external affairs critic Don Johnston joined Mr. Frith.

"In the interests of international security, I call upon the Government of Canada to exercise its option and cancel cruise missile tests without further delay," Mr. Johnston said, days after the Government announced it has renewed the agreement with the United States for another five years.

"I urge the Government to show courage and act now."

He also called for negotiations with neighboring countries "to achieve a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Arctic."

Mr. Turner, his party well ahead in the polls, has been preaching to his troops for months that he wants to wait

until closer to the election before offering many specifics on policy.

But Mr. Frith said Feb. 19 that the party has gone about as far as it can go in the polls by bashing the Government and now should start giving voters something more substantial.

"I think the Canadian public is asking the Liberal party to explain its vision for this country in the 1990s and beyond," he said in a speech in London, Ont. "Voters, I think, are going to view with skepticism a party which tells the public not to ask for policy until closer to the next election."

A former caucus chairman, Mr. Frith followed up Feb. 23 by saying Ottawa should give notice that it intends to withdraw from the controversial five-year agreement signed by Pierre Trudeau's Liberal government in 1983. The agreement allows the United States to test cruise missiles in Canada.

The Liberal convention in November also called for an end to the tests — the latest was conducted Sunday — but its views are not binding on the leader.

Asked yesterday about Mr. Frith's statement, Mr. Turner replied: "That was one of the resolutions that was before the convention and it's something that, as we move closer to an election and as we have further deliberations in caucus, we'll be more specific on. He's not yet speaking on behalf of the party."

/9317

CSO: 5220/32

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR ASSAILS JAPAN MILITARY'S CREATION OF CHEMICAL SUBUNITS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 87 p 4

[Article by IZVESTIYA own correspondent S. Agofonov under the rubric "Rejoinder": "JDA Answers the Call"]

[Text] Recent Soviet proposals aimed toward achieving real agreements concerning the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their arsenals evoked a broad world response.

They have demonstrated once again that the Soviet Union is ready to take radical steps for the resolution of this problem and is consistent and flexible on the path towards the realization of the goal it has set. Precisely the same evaluation of the Soviet initiatives was given by the Japanese mass information media.

However, there were other sorts of responses in Japan as well. The question in particular is about the plans of the Japanese Defence Agency, (JDA), which have come to light, to begin this spring to organize special subunits of the ground forces, called "chemical detachments." Their function, according to the paper MAINICHI includes training for the operations during chemical and bacteriological wars. In accordance with this plan, in 1990 similar detachments will be created in 12 Japanese divisions.

MAINICHI notes that for the first time such sub-units are being created in Japan. The paper writes that the appearance of "chemical detachments" in the structure of "self-defense forces" is motivated by the abrupt enlargement of similar formations of the USSR Armed Forces. In other words, the "Soviet threat" is again being given as the fundamental argument for the accelerated growth of military preparations. It is notable that the comprehensive plan of the JDA for the formation of "chemical detachments" is being built on the so-called "northern strategy" and the first special sub-units will appear namely in northern Japan in divisions based on Hokkaido.

In this specific case the JDA is on the level of their senior partner in the sphere of military strategy -- the Pentagon. The local press emphasizes that the decision of the Japanese staff was due first of all to pressure from overseas. The uproar about the chemical detachments in the USSR became a significant constituent in the propagandistic charges of the American military department long ago.

In the beginning of this year the Pentagon's intention to start building specially protected structures in the case of chemical and bacteriological warfare became known. This took place on the military bases of Misawa (located in the Japanese prefecture Aomori) and Iwakuni (located in the prefecture Yamaguchi). The pretence for this was always the same - the Soviet "chemical threat."

Is this "response" in need of detailed commentary? It appears that it is unlikely. The matter is not so much in the shortage of newspaper space but in direct comparison of real concerns and actions. Concrete steps for the liquidation of chemical weapons or the outright preparation for chemical warfare, good will or hard language of confrontation - the divergence is very obvious.

CSO:5200/1354

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

NATO, WARSAW PACT BEGIN INFORMAL CSCE DISARMAMENT TALKS

Paris AFP in English 1039 GMT 17 Feb 87

[Text] Vienna, Feb 17 (AFP) — NATO and Warsaw Pact representatives opened informal talks at the French Embassy here Tuesday on how to plan fresh negotiations on conventional disarmament in all of Europe.

A French Embassy communique said the 16-member North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and seven-country Warsaw Pact were "to elaborate a mandate for new talks" on disarmament in Europe from "the Atlantic to the Urals" as proposed by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev last year.

The new talks are to be held under the auspices of the 35 member Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), but effectively led by the two military alliances.

For 13 years NATO and the East-bloc Warsaw Pact have been holding Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks on an area covering Central Europe — East and West Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg — but have not even come close to agreement.

"The big result of this meeting would be to eventually decide on a second meeting," said one member of a western delegation at the informal talks.

Each of the 23 delegations has three members, but each delegation has decided its own level of representation.

Most of those present are CSCE disarmament experts and the Soviet Union was represented by its CSCE delegation chief Yuriy Kashlev, informed sources said.

"We are going to listen to what they want to tell us, but we are also going to explain our position that there are not only NATO and Warsaw Pact members between the Atlantic Ocean and the Urals," he said in an interview with the Hungarian Communist Party daily *Nepszabadsag*.

"Military security questions have up to now been discussed by 35 countries, including the neutral and non-aligned countries who played an important role at Stockholm" — the European disarmament conference — Mr. Kashlev added.

Austria has also said that all 35 CSCE countries should be represented while France has refused to take part in "bloc-to-bloc" talks. But the French Government has agreed to the NATO compromise whereby the new talks are held under the CSCE umbrella despite being effectively led by the alliances.

The CSCE is made up of all of Europe, except Albania, and the United States and Canada.

/9274

CSO: 5240/053

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW REPORTS ON VISIT BY TONGAN OFFICIAL, RAROTONGA TALKS

Demichev Meeting, Luncheon

PM251109 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Excerpts] Talks were held 20 February between P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Crown Prince Tupouto'a of Tonga, Tongan minister of foreign affairs and defense, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The following took part in the talks: On the Soviet side N.I. Kotliyar, USSR minister of the fish industry; Yu.G. Bakhtin, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Yu.A. Izrael, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; V.F. Mordvinov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; and senior officials of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and a number of ministries and departments; on the Tongan side S.T. Aho, Tongan ambassador to the USSR, and other officials accompanying Crown Prince Tupouto'a.

P.N. Demichev spoke about the Soviet people's creative work to implement the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum on accelerating the USSR's socioeconomic development and transforming the quality of all aspects of Soviet society. Tupouto'a's attention was drawn to the Soviet concept of peace expounded in M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World and for Mankind's Survival" in Moscow and the Soviet Union's persistent efforts to eliminate nuclear and other kinds of weapons of mass destruction; to strengthen mutual understanding, trust, and cooperation among the peoples; and to create an all-embracing system of international security.

P.N. Demichev noted that halting nuclear tests is the simplest and most reliable way to end the race in nuclear arms and their further qualitative improvement. Unfortunately, the United States declined to accept the opportunity of joining the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions declared by the Soviet Union in August 1985 and preferred to continue testing its own nuclear weapons, thereby wrecking the opportunity of taking a major step toward nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet side set out its stance in support of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. As is well known, the Soviet Union was the first nuclear power to sign

Protocols 2 and 3 of the Rarotonga Treaty and has urged the other nuclear powers to adopt a most responsible attitude to this initiative by the South Pacific countries, to do everything for their part to ensure the zone's truly nonnuclear status, and to help strengthen its operation.

The exchange of opinions on problems of ensuring security and peaceful cooperation in Asia and the Pacific revealed the sides hold identical standpoints on the need for all states in the region to step up their efforts in a joint search for mutually acceptable ways of solving problems of international life in that part of the world.

P.N. Demichev stressed that the USSR is seeking through joint efforts to impart greater dynamism to bilateral relations, to settle regional conflicts, to reduce the level of military confrontation, to create an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding making it possible to qualitatively change the situation in the region, and to draw up a package of measures ensuring reliable security and broad, mutually beneficial cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region. The solution of this task is regarded in the Soviet Union as an integral part of the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

Tupouto'a noted the importance of the Soviet program for peace and security in Asia put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech at Vladivostok.

The Soviet side was represented at the luncheon by the following: P.N. Demichev; Ya.Ya. Vagris, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; L.N. Tolkunov and A.E. Voss, chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; ministers, chairmen of USSR state committees, and other officials.

There was an exchange of speeches. P.N. Demichev stressed in his speech that the countries of Asia and the Pacific can and must play an important role in ensuring world peace. As an Asian and Pacific power the Soviet Union sincerely seeks to ensure that the Asian and Pacific region is not a source of tension and is actively involved in the general process of creating an all-embracing system of international security. Mutually beneficial cooperation with the countries of the Pacific constitutes the material basis for detente and serves as a reliable route to mutual understanding among the peoples living in the region. Soviet people would sincerely like to see the states of Oceania which have embarked on the path of independent development as their partners. The Soviet Union's approach to developing relations with the Kingdom of Tonga is also determined by this line.

Meeting With Shevardnadze

LD201727 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 20 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS -- A conversation was held here today between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Crown Prince, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence of the Kingdom of Tonga Tupouto'a, staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed to a sharp aggravation of regional and global problems. he emphasized the need for a resolute opposition to those who would like to build their

own security at the expense of the security of others. As Mikhail Gorbachev said in his speech at the international forum, the stake in such a game is too steep: it is mankind's survival.

The attention of the minister of the Kingdom of Tonga was called to a complex of the Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at a radical improvement of the international situation, at the creation of a nuclear free and non-violent world, the development of broad and stable international cooperation.

When the situation in the Asian-Pacific region was discussed, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet Union declared in favour of that region not being a source of tension, an arena of a military-political confrontation, but joining vigorously in the overall process of the creation of an all-embracing system of international security.

It was noted in this connection that the treaty on the nuclear free zone in the southern part of the Pacific that came into effect in December 1986 has become a real contribution to the creation of a system of security in the Asian-Pacific region, consolidation of a system of security in the Asian-Pacific region, consolidation of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and lowering of nuclear danger. The Soviet Union supports the aims of the treaty of Rarotonga and urges other nuclear powers to do everything to ensure a truly non-nuclear status of the zone created. The signing by the Soviet Union of the protocols to the treaty is a good example of interaction of the USSR and South Pacific countries in the interests of peace and security in the region.

Topouto'a spoke highly of the Soviet initiatives concerning peace and security in Asia formulated in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok and entire policy of the Soviet Union aimed at preventing nuclear catastrophe, at curbing the arms race, improving the international situation.

The ministers expressed the readiness for the continuation of the dialogue in the interests of developing bilateral relations and also consolidating interaction in the struggle to strengthen peace and international security.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1343

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NORWAY SEES NATO DOCTRINE AS HAMPERING NORDIC ZONE

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 4 Feb 1987 p 16

[Article by Olav Trygve Storvik: "Norway Wants New NATO Nuclear Strategy"]

[Text] Norway will take the initiative in NATO to get the nuclear weapons strategy changed. In the present alliance strategy the first use of nuclear weapons is not excluded, and this is what Norway wants changed. It is necessary if one is to achieve a nuclear weapons free zone in the North while Norway and Denmark remain members of NATO. The issue will be discussed in NATO after it is debated in the Storting. Foreign Minister Knut Frydenlund told DAGBLADET.

Yesterday Frydenlund was busy with the government budget conference at Randsvangen, but the acting press spokesman, Jon Ramberg, confirmed the content of the article in DAGBLADET. According to the foreign minister there is a close connection between the work to reduce NATO's dependence upon nuclear weapons and the desire for a nuclear free zone in the North.

In the security policy milieu Frydenlund's statements are interpreted as an opening in connection with the Foreign Office's work on a Storting report on security policy, based on reports from three committees. They are the Colding committee on nuclear free zones, the strategy committee headed by former Undersecretary Bjorn Bruland, and the so-called consequence analysis that deals with Norwegian weapons purchases. Frydenlund's statements to DAGBLADET give probable political signals about parts of the contents of the coming Storting report.

Confirms

Acting press spokesman Jon Ramberg did not wish to discuss the contents of Frydenlund's statements but confirmed that the department's work on the Storting report has reached the stage that it can be presented to the Storting on short notice if the government decides to ask for it. Frydenlund's opening must also probably be seen in connection with the Nordic foreign ministers' meeting in Reykjavik in March. There, among other things, the establishment of a civil servant group will be discussed that will work out how a nuclear free zone in the North can come into existence.

According to Frydenlund, one of the problems is that a Nordic zone will conflict with some parts of NATO strategy. This strategy does not exclude the possibility for NATO to be the first to use nuclear weapons in a mass Soviet conventional attack. Here the very nucleus of the strategy of deterrence is at stake, to frighten the opponent away from threats or attack by increasing his uncertainty about what will happen. Frydenlund, and presumably the draft of the Storting report, say that three possibilities can be imagined for the relationship between the zone and NATO's nuclear strategy:

Norway can unilaterally reject the alliance's strategy, NATO can eliminate the Nordic area from this strategy, or also the alliance can agree to change the nuclear strategy. Frydenlund rejects the first alternative and considers the second to be hardly realistic. Therefore only the third alternative remains as Frydenlund sees it: that NATO change its nuclear strategy by reducing the dependence upon nuclear weapons.

How this is to be solved in practice is a problem that Frydenlund did not discuss in his statements to DAGBLADET. The issue clearly has a professional military side that the foreign minister probably does not want to get into. An interesting question therefore arises on whether the report the Foreign Office probably will present in the course of the Storting's spring session will deal with the professional military view on this question in a thoroughgoing way, or whether that side of the issue will be toned down.

9124

CNO: 5200/2508

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

FINNISH OFFICIAL, NEWSPAPER URGE CONTINUING TESTING HALT

Foreign Ministry in Geneva

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 13 Feb 87 p 29

[Article: "Finland Stressed the Importance of Nuclear Testing Halt"]

[Text] Geneva (STT) Klaus Tornudd, Assistant Secretary of State at the Finnish Foreign Ministry, emphasized the importance of achieving a nuclear test ban in his speech Thursday at a 40 nation disarmament conference in Geneva.

Tornudd considered that negotiations which advance one step at a time offer the best opportunity under the present conditions to begin negotiations on an agreement to completely ban nuclear testing.

Tornudd emphasized that the nuclear test ban must be suited to verification. He said that Finland participates actively in the seismic verification task force operating under the auspices of the Geneva disarmament conference.

The seismic task force attempts to create technical preconditions for the international supervision of the nuclear test ban. Finland has recently decided to increase considerably its funding for the seismic verification project.

The Geneva disarmament conference is the most important multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations. Forty UN member nations belong to it. Finland belongs to it as an observer.

Paper: New Arms Race

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 8 Feb 87 p 3

[Editorial: "The Danger of a New Nuclear Arms Race"]

[Text] A new round of the arms race appears to be approaching. The US carried out a new nuclear weapons test and the USSR responded by announcing that it is considering halting its year-and-a-half old test moratorium. This would be an unfortunate step toward increasing the arms buildup.

France is also continuing its tests without letup regardless of international opposition. The arrogance of the two western nuclear nations is striking. The western strategy is actually based expressly on nuclear arms intimidation. However, it is partly due to this that a third world war has been avoided.

Nevertheless it is impossible to defend the continuing development of new nuclear weapons. Not even the bravest soldier or president can deny that nuclear weapons testing has reached an unavoidable dead end, as a result of the Chernobyl accident. Even the nuclear nations should admit to this fact.

The entire future of the test ban seems distressing. The US is basing its Star Wars, the SDI, or imaginary space shield, on nuclear explosives. Because of this it will continue nuclear testing until it is able to transform the force of a nuclear explosion into an energy source for a laser or a particle weapon.

There may still be an attempt in the background to develop new nuclear weapons which could be used in a war without the fear of creating a nuclear winter. Such a goal explains only in part why nuclear testing is continued contrary to all common sense. If the US is not this cynical, the present behavior of the nation can be explained only as the capriciousness of an aging president.

12989

CSO: 5200/2494

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

FINNISH PRESIDENT SAYS COUNTRY READYING NEW INITIATIVES

Helsinki UUSI SUOMI in Finnish 24 Jan 87 p 3

[Article: "Mauno Koivisto: Finland Ready for Nuclear Weapons Initiative"]

[Text] Finland is ready to join in a nuclear disarmament initiative involving a group composed of representatives of 5 continents, said President Mauno Koivisto in an interview recently given to the newspaper TIMES OF INDIA.

During the interview, Koivisto noted that Finland could, among other things, offer technical equipment for the observation and verification of the nuclear ban. He also said he intended to make a proposal about this to the Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi when he visits India next month.

The group consisting of the representatives from 5 continents was founded in 1984, and it has worked to achieve a nuclear test ban between the great powers.

12989

CSO: 5200/2494

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW DELHI: PALME COMMISSION CALLS FOR COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English 12 Feb 87 p 8

[Text]

NEW DELHI, Feb. 11 (PTI).

THE Palme commission on disarmament and security has said that it is "imperative that meaningful steps be taken immediately to limit nuclear arms and to move toward nuclear disarmament" and called for a comprehensive nuclear test ban (CTB) to achieve these vital objectives.

The commission is also of the view that there are no credible technical obstacles to the completion of a CTB and that it was "solely a matter of political will".

In a report titled, "Toward a comprehensive test ban", the commission has urged the nuclear weapon states to complete a CTB as "a matter of the highest priority".

The report, just published, is the outcome of a suggestion made by the commission's chairman, the late Olof Palme, at the group's sitting in Delhi in January 1986 to initiate a public debate on the matter. It summarises the political and technical arguments for a halt to nuclear testing.

The commission, in an earlier 1982 report, "Common Security", had also backed the need for a CTB to control nuclear arms and eventually to achieve disarmament.

(Till the assassination of Mr. Palme in February last year, the commission was officially known by the name "Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues". But now, "Palme Commission" is also its official nomenclature.)

Stating that a CTB "would be an essential step toward the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons and the achievement of common security for all nations", the report puts out the case for such a ban thus:

In the short term, a cessation of nuclear tests by the leading military powers would have dramatic sym-

bolic and psychological effects — effects that could contribute measurably to a more favourable political atmosphere in which the risk of war would be reduced and rapid progress might be made in the whole range of arms control negotiations.

Over the longer term, a ban could help curtail development of advanced types of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems.

Moreover, a CTB could help limit proliferation of nuclear weapon capabilities to additional nations, by reducing the incentives which national leaders might otherwise perceive to move in that direction and by strengthening the hands of anti-proliferation forces within emerging nuclear powers.

And, over a very long period of time, the cessation of nuclear testing could cause the nuclear powers to become even more reluctant to consider the potential use of nuclear weapons in a pre-emptive attack against an opponent's nuclear forces.

The commission, however, admits that while helping to lower considerably the risk of a nuclear war a CTB alone would not be a "sufficient means of ending the nuclear danger".

How to go about to achieve a CTB? The Palme commission says the ban could result either from an informal moratorium or from a formal, negotiated treaty.

It also answers some of the problems as those pertaining to verification and reliability in the goal toward a CTB.

About verification, it says, it should no longer be a hurdle. With the installation of a series of unmanned seismic stations on the territory of each nuclear weapon state, with the aid of non-nuclear countries and with provision for on-site checks on a challenge basis, the problem is attended to.

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA ON SHULTZ PRC VISIT: U.S., PRC SDI, NFZ POLICIES DIFFER

PM101417 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Mar 87 First Edition p 5

[Article by Ye. Sevastyanov under the rubric "Notes on International Themes":
"Shultz' Visit to the PRC"]

[Excerpts] The U.S. secretary of state has been in China on an official visit. G. Shultz was received by Zhao Ziyang, acting general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and premier of the State Council; Deng Xiaoping, chairman of the CPC Central Advisory Commission; PRC President Li Xiannian; Li Peng, vice premier of the State Council; and Zhang Aiping, minister of national defense; and had talks with Wu Xueqian, minister of foreign affairs. G. Shultz also visited a number of Chinese cities.

The U.S. secretary of state claimed that the talks confirmed that Beijing and Washington have "common interests" with regard to "some of the main sources of tension in Asia," among which he cited in particular the situation around Afghanistan and Cambodia. At the same time, he noted that in addition to "shared and close positions" there are "differences and divergences of opinion" in approaches to international problems.

In this context, I would like to note that the differences in the positions of the PRC and the United States on problems of ensuring international security and disarmament are becoming increasingly noticeable. China has criticized the Washington administration's "Strategic Defense Initiative." In addition to the pledge adopted in 1964 not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the PRC announced in 1986 that it was ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. On 10 February, China acceded to the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific (the Rarotonga Treaty). A few days ago, a PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman denounced the "Team Spirit-87" U.S.-South Korean maneuvers. The Chinese press is drawing attention to the astronomical growth of U.S. military spending, the intensification of neoglobalist tendencies in the foreign policy strategy of the Reagan administration, and the reactionary phenomena in its domestic policy course. Beijing also has expressed displeasure at the militarization of Japan.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1350

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTER VISITS AUSTRALIA

Issues Arrival Statement

LD031057 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, arrived in Canberra today on an official visit at the invitation of the Australian Government. He was met at the airport by Hayden, Australia's minister of foreign affairs, and other officials. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze made a statement on arrival.

We have, he said, traveled around the world as a testimony to our commitment to a simple but great idea. Presented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, it says: All states and peoples of the earth must participate in setting up a comprehensive system for international security and peace, and the word of each one on this subject should be heard and received with the utmost attention. We have come to Australia to exchange views on possibilities and ways of a transition to a nonnuclear and nonviolent world, of ensuring calm and stability in the Asian Pacific region, and of strengthening cooperation between our states. We await with interest our meetings and talks with Governor General Sir Ninian Stephen, with Prime Minister Robert Hawke, and with my colleague, William Hayden. I would like to hope that they will want to know more details of the processes under way in the Soviet Union.

There is no doubt that we will have no shortage of topics for conversation, continued Comrade Shevardnadze, particularly since this is the first time we have had the opportunity of such a broad dialogue. I would not like to repeat things which are already well known, for example on what divides us -- a vast amount of land and sky and a considerable distance in political and other differences. It is with great pleasure that I speak of what brings us closer: of the memory of our people which contains gratitude to the Australian sailors and pilots who accompanied transport ships with cargoes for our victory, of the pioneer spirit peculiar to both our peoples in mastering the difficult natural world, in protecting it, and in conquering the difficult roads of the earth, of the proximity and even identity of position on a series of central issues of peace, security, and the survival humanity in the nuclear and space age, of the bonds of cultural and spiritual ties, thanks to which the names of Bernhardt and Eccles, Wilson and White, Melba and Sutherland, Drysdale and Nolan and many other outstanding representatives of Australia are known and respected in our country.

I am convinced that the meetings and conversations on Australian soil will facilitate better and more profound mutual understanding between our countries and peoples as well as the interests of peace and of a single security, the same for everyone. I wish all Canberra residents and the citizens of Australia well-being, happiness and peace.

The Soviet-Australian talks began today.

Hayden Welcomes Shevardnadze

LD031512 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Canberra March 3 TASS -- Australian Foreign Minister William Hayden, addressing Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, at the airport in the Australian capital today, said that the visit was an extremely important event.

This visit, he said, should promote a dialogue between the two countries and the solution of questions of mutual interest in the sphere of bilateral relations.

The Australian minister said that his country acknowledged and respected the role of the Soviet Union as one of the two great powers and the immense role and responsibility this carried.

He expressed satisfaction with the report of the latest proposals advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with regard to medium-range missiles.

Hayden said he discussed this issue with U.S. representative Edward Rowny only yesterday.

The Australian minister pointed out that Australia would back as far as possible productive discussions of these issues between the USSR and the United States.

He expressed the hope that they would be crowned with success and become a major step, the first out of many on the way towards effective arms control.

Shevardnadze Meets With Hawke

LD031556 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Canberra March 3 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, who is currently on an official visit in Australia, has met today with Australia's Prime Minister Robert Hawke.

A detailed exchange of views was held on topical international and regional issues.

Eduard Shevardnadze briefed the Australian prime minister on the strategy outlined by the 27th Congress of the CPSU for accelerating the Soviet Union's socio-economic development, the policy of reorganization and renewal in all fields of the Soviet society's life.

It was stressed from the Soviet side that in the complex and controversial world today, where everything is dominated by the need for a choice between mankind's existence and non-existence, new approaches and methods of settling international disputes, new thinking corresponding with the realities of this nuclear-space age are necessary.

The Soviet foreign minister has drawn the Australian prime minister's attention to the Soviet-scale programme for the total elimination of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons by the end of this century, the major Soviet initiatives tabled at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik, the proposal of the USSR and of the other socialist countries on the creation of a comprehensive international peace and security system, the history making Delhi Declaration on the principles for nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world.

The significance was pointed out of the proposal spelled out by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the problem of a cut in and elimination of medium-range nuclear weapons.

Eduard Shevardnadze and Robert Hawke declared for reaching as soon as possible specific positive results at the current bilateral and multilateral talks on the limitation and reduction of weapons, with an eye to putting an end to the weapons race on earth and preventing it in outer space, reducing the level of military confrontation.

Both sides have expressed the view that under the conditions of remaining tensions, responsible actions are necessary to contribute to building healthier international relations, strengthening universal peace and building up confidence and mutual understanding among nations.

The Soviet foreign minister has explained the programme put forward by the Soviet Union for ensuring peace and security, developing the relations of goodneighbourliness and mutually-beneficial cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region in the light of the provisions spelled out by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech in Vladivostok and in his statements during the visit to India. The Soviet Union favours that that region should not be a source of tension, an arena of military-political confrontation, but should actively join in the process of forming a comprehensive international security system.

The prime minister said that the Soviet proposals had been received with interest, above all in the context of the efforts made to prevent military rivalries and ensure broad peaceful political and economic cooperation in the region.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership Eduard Shevardnadze invited the Australian prime minister to go on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Shevardnadze Talks With Hayden

LD031602 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Canberra March 3 TASS -- Talks between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Australia's Minister for Foreign Affairs William Hayden started here today. Some topical problems of the international situation were discussed.

The consensus was expressed about the need to improve the complex international situation, to take measures in the sphere of nuclear disarmament to create the conditions protecting civilisation against nuclear destruction.

During the talks an important place was assigned to problems of settling conflict situations in the world. Each of the sides set out its stance on questions of settlement around Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

The sides discussed the ways of establishing cooperation among countries situated in the Pacific basin.

Hayden Hosts Luncheon

LD032151 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 3 Mar 87

[Text] Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, started his official visit to Australia today. Our correspondent, Vladimir Beloshapko, reports from Canberra:

[Beloshapko] Comrade Shevardnadze and the officials accompanying him were met at the plane by William Hayden, Australian minister for foreign affairs; Samoteykin, USSR ambassador in Australia; Pocock, Australian ambassador in the USSR; members of Soviet establishments in Australia; and heads of diplomatic representations of socialist countries.

Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze made a short statement at the airport in which he expressed his confidence that the meetings and conversations on Australian soil would create a better and more profound understanding between both countries and peoples, as the interests of peace and security are one and the same for all. Comrade Shevardnadze expressed his wish that all the residents of Canberra -- all the citizens of Australia -- would be prosperous, happy, and peaceful.

Talks started today between Comrade Shevardnadze and his Australian colleague, William Hayden. In honor of the Soviet guest, the Australian minister for foreign affairs gave a lunch at which William Hayden and Comrade Shevardnadze exchanged speeches. In his speech, the USSR minister of foreign affairs stressed that the Soviet Union desires to build a nonnuclear and nonviolent world, to ensure calm and stability in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region, and to strengthen cooperation between the USSR and Australia. In the evening, talks were held between Comrade Shevardnadze and Australian Prime Minister Hawke. The soviet-Australian talks will continue tomorrow.

The local press, radio, and television have given a great deal of attention to the arrival of the Soviet delegation. This visit has been called historic by the paper THE AUSTRALIAN. It is the first time that a high-ranking representative of the Soviet leadership has come to Australia, says the paper, and notes that Comrade Shevardnadze's visit is one of the practical steps in the realization of proposals contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok in July of last year, a speech that outlined the USSR's policy in the Asian-Pacific Ocean region.

Second Talks 'Difficult,' 'Frank'

LD040943 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, now on a visit in Australia, has held another round of talks with his Australian counterpart, William Hayden.

According to officials in Canberra the talks were difficult but frank and honest. Shevardnadze confirmed the willingness of the Soviet Union to work for a world free from nuclear weapons and violence. He assured the Australian Government that the USSR had no plans threatening Pacific countries.

At a news conference in Canberra he expressed the readiness of the Soviet Union to reduce to 33 the number of its SS-20 missiles stationed in its Asian part. If agreement is reached with the United States on scrapping intermediate range missiles in Europe the Soviet Foreign Minister said, such missiles will not remain in Asia for long.

Shevardnadze: Cut Asia SS-20's to 33

BK040539 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0500 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Mr Shevardnadze, says there will be no Soviet military presence in the South Pacific. Speaking at a news conference in Canberra at the end of his talks with the Australian Government, Mr Shevardnadze said Moscow was building its relations with the South Pacific countries.

Mr Shevardnadze said fishing agreements in the region would be based on mutual interests and would be consistent with international law. He said the nature of the Soviet presence would depend on what South Pacific countries wanted. However, Mr Shevardnadze emphasized there would be no Soviet military presence in the region.

Mr Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union faced a potential military threat in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. He said the threat was posed by the American military presence in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Micronesia. The foreign minister said a threat was also posed by Japan, which he claimed had stepped over the threshold of responsible moderation in increasing its military forces.

Mr Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union was entitled to have an interest in stability in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, where it had important lines of communications. Moscow had to be concerned about Washington's basic regional policies and the buildup of the U.S. Navy.

Mr Shevardnadze said the cooperation of America was needed to deal with the problems of the Pacific. To remove mutual suspicion, the Soviet Union was prepared to limit the number of its SS-20 missiles in East Asia to 33. Mr Shevardnadze said if nuclear missiles were eliminated in Europe, they would not be required in Asia. He added that the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Treaty will also place constraint on Soviet activities.

No Pacific Military Presence

BK040242 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0230 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Mr Shevardnadze, today ruled out the possibility of a Soviet military presence in the South Pacific. Speaking at a press conference in Canberra at the end of his talks with the government, Mr Shevardnadze said Moscow was building relations with the South Pacific states. He said there was no reason for Australians to be suspicious about this.

The Soviet foreign minister, speaking through an interpreter, said the nature of the Soviet presence would depend on what the Pacific states wanted. He said that if there were an expansion between Moscow and the Pacific nations in trade, economic cooperation, tourism, athletic exchanges, and other exchanges, that would obviously lead to a greater Soviet presence. However, Mr Shevardnadze stressed there would be no Soviet military presence.

Shevardnadze Dinner Speech

LD041829 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1524 GMT 4 Mar 87

[Text] Canberra, 4 Mar (TASS) -- Australian Foreign Minister William Hayden hosted a luncheon in honor of Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign Minister.

Addressing those assembled, W. Hayden noted that although our countries belong to different social systems relations between them must be built on the basis of existing realities. The essence of these realities is such that if yet one more world war were to break out, no one would be able to gather themselves back together from the pieces; there would be no resurrection. That is why talks on questions of nuclear weapons must become a deeply understood consistent search for decisions, while fully understanding that their failure would be final and irrevocable. The minister spoke highly of the new Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles, having expressed the hope that it would be implemented as soon as possible.

Our visit to Australia, Eduard Shevardnadze stated, is the first in the 40-year existence of diplomatic relations between our countries. Of course, it would be possible to say in this context: Better late than never. However, I prefer to put it another way: Better today so that tomorrow it isn't too late.

Once it was possible to give as one's excuse the great distances and the excessive effort involved in changing climatic zones. Nowadays, when the planet is too small and unprotected from the vast threat of nuclear destruction, these excuses are all invalid. So we travel about the world heading for those corners of the globe most distant from us, in order to say: Let us unite our efforts and together stave off the nuclear Armageddon. There is no country today in the address book of mankind with which we would not wish to cooperate actively in this direction.

Australia for us is one of the leaders. And not just because it comes first in alphabetical order. For our country, whose leader has put forward a project for a nonnuclear world, which provides for the elimination of the most terrible means of mass destruction by the start of the coming century, a country cannot be remote where 100 municipalities and even a whole state have declared their territories free of nuclear weapons. We applaud these decisions not as detached observers. After all, the deciding argument in international security issues is, for us, the will of the public. We are sensitive to its voice and take its opinion into account -- even in instances when, for a number of reasons, it is hard for us to go half way. Yet all the same, we do go because, I repeat, this is the most reliable and most weighty argument -- the will of the majority of mankind.

It seemed after Reykjavik that everything had been tied up in such knots that it would only have been possible to untie them simultaneously. But we took into consideration the alarm and hope being expressed in many countries of Europe, and we, as Mikhail

Gorbachev stated on 28 February, took the bold decision to examine the question of medium-range missiles outside the overall Reykjavik package of mutual agreements and concessions. And let no one say that a great power takes back its word. On the contrary, it is sending forward its word, beyond the limit which others have been unable to overcome because of a stagnation of political thinking. As for the new way of thinking, world public opinion also counts as a component part of it for us.

This position is directly inscribed in the philosophical concept of peace and universal security approved by the United Nations, and so everything which brings its practical implementation nearer is being, and will be, supported by us. Precisely for this reason the Soviet Union has joined the Rarotonga Treaty, supporting the efforts of Australia and its like-minded neighbors in the region to create a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific.

Pacific security, the system and the mechanism for creating it are yet another sphere where, in my opinion, there are and must be no great watersheds between us. Let them remain on geographical maps while they are removed from political maps and replaced with expanses of dialogue and cooperation. It was toward this that the Vladivostok speech of General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev was aimed, addressed to Australia also as an influential Pacific power.

In our view the Delhi Declaration signed in November of last year on the principles of a nuclear-free world and a world of nonviolence, should also have been read sympathetically by Australia, which opposes the nuclear arms race and the creation of space weapons, and is in favor of ending nuclear explosions and of eliminating chemical weapons. The silence too, which reigned over our nuclear test-sites for over 1 and 1/2 years, must also have been to the liking of your country.

But, while gladly speaking of all these zones where we coincide or come close together, I have not yet answered the question: Why have we come here to see you?

I was told that in certain of your coastal cities to this day, cannons look out to sea which were put there last century to repel an "invasion by the Russians." The fact that not a single one has so much as been fired is a fact sufficiently eloquent in itself. However it is still good in that it illustrates certain obvious truths.

If knowledge gives birth often to dispute, then ignorance, as a rule, gives birth to fear. We live in the 20th century, but as it seems to me, you do not know us very well, you have no clear perception of us, to what we aspire, the more so now, today, at the stage of restructuring and renewal in our society, and the broad democratization of all spheres of our life.

That is why, the moment we make a first step towards the expanses neighboring on Australia, reefs of fears and suspicions arise, directed towards us. Maybe I am wrong, but I am speaking frankly, and it is in the same key of frankness and directness that I intend to conduct the talks with you, Mr Minister and with Australia's highest leaders.

It is beyond my power to remove the Great Barrier Reef -- which does not divide your country from ours -- but is possible to remove what I have termed the reefs of threats and fears. That is indeed the reason why we have come to your country. We have come in the hope that we shall succeed in doing this. We have come with hopes for a better future in our relations and in cooperation for the benefit of peace.

A few words about the first impressions occasioned by meeting your country. It differs a great deal and in many things from ours. There are, however, things which are equally dear to people in many and different countries, even if geographically they are on the opposite sides of the earth from each other. We have the same understanding of concepts, such as grain, bread and man, made warm by the same symbolism and beautifully expressed in the poem by the Australian poetess Nancy Kiesel.

When laying the wreath this morning at the war memorial, I recalled the jetties in Polar Murmansk, where Soviet people greeted the Australian seamen who were escorting transport ships carrying arms for the Red Army during the years of the Second World War.

Several decades later, some of these brave people were presented with Soviet awards.

Nor will we forget the campaign you started up here in those years to collect money for the aid fund for our country, which broke the back of Fascism.

At times, forgetting the past is to deprive oneself of a future. We do not forget, we remember, and are striving to preserve and multiply the sentiment of reciprocal respect.

Mr Minister, in effect our talks have already started, but have not yet really got going. I think that they will be frank [otkrovenyy], not only in the diplomatic sense. For me personally there are no closed subjects, no inconvenient questions.

For now, prior to the business that we have come here for I, with great pleasure, wish Mr and Mrs Hayden health and prosperity, and to all those present, happiness and success.

Moscow TV Interviews Hayden

LD041752 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Mar 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze's visit to Australia continues.

[Correspondent V. Ilyashenko, identified by screen caption] A Soviet-Australian protocol on consultations was signed today in Canberra, the Australian capital. It was signed by the foreign ministers of the two countries. The protocol provides for a regular exchange of opinions on international problems of mutual interest, as well as questions of bilateral relations, including political, trade-and-economic and cultural links.

Comrade Shevardnadze also gave a news conference for journalists today. He noted that the conversations with Prime Minister Hawke and Foreign Minister Hayden were frank and allowed for the discussion of a broad range of problems, including questions of strengthening peace and security in Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin. Our country, comrade Shevardnadze stressed, will respect the status of nuclear-free zones in this part of the world. This is borne out by the USSR's signing of the Rarotonga Treaty.

Comrade Shevardnadze replied to numerous questions from journalists. [video shows Shevardnadze addressing news conference]

Today we had a conversation with Australian Foreign Minister Hayden.

[Begin Recording] [Hayden, speaking in English fading into superimposed Russian translation] The results of the discussions on bilateral relations and international problems are very encouraging, in particular on arms control and disarmament, and it is noted that these problems reflect the situation in our part of the Pacific Ocean. We discussed the Soviet proposals on strengthening peace in Asia, as well as the question of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific, inasmuch as Australia is known to be responsible for the implementation of the Raratonga Treaty which was signed recently.

[Ilyashenko, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation] What is your reaction to the latest Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles?

[Hayden] We find it very encouraging and we are saying so openly. We are insisting that the U.S. respond positively to this proposal. We have already spoken to them about this.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1350

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTAGE ON VISIT OF ITALY'S ANDREOTTI

Detailed Talks With Gorbachev

LD271753 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow February 27 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev today received in the Kremlin the Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti.

A detailed exchange of views on key issues of European and international security, in which the Soviet-Italian dialogue holds an important place, was conducted in a frank and well-wishing atmosphere.

What international relations now lack are positive, bold steps, especially joint steps, Mikhail Gorbachev said. In this connection the question of Europe's role was raised on a major plane. Lately it appeared to be displaying desire to make its contribution, the Soviet leader went on. The Europeans are making an effort and have already accomplished something, first of all in Stockholm. But these are only the very first steps to utilise Europe's wealth of experience in accordance with the requirements of the times.

Mikhail Gorbachev again refuted the still widespread suspicions that the USSR supposedly wants to wreck the Atlantic alliance and wrest Western Europe from America. We are realists here in the Kremlin, Mikhail Gorbachev went on, but at the same time we proceed from the premise that in world affairs nobody can substitute for Europe.

Noting again the deep connection between the Soviet Union's present home and foreign policy, between the restructuring in the USSR and its striving for improved international relations, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that "we would like to be predictable, we are conducting our affairs constructively and with a sense of responsibility. But if somebody wants to draw from this the conclusion that the USSR is more interested in disarmament than the West nothing will come out of this and again a chance to start this process will be lost".

"The task objectively exists of placing East-West relations on the soil of reality and, in ridding ourselves of the status of nuclear hostages, of solving a multitude of problems -- economic, ecological and humanitarian. There are more than a hundred new states in the world now which are searching for their road and they have a hundred times more problems than the states which have centuries behind them. Account should also be taken of these problems both in relations between the developed and the developing worlds and in East-West relations", Mikhail Gorbachev said.

In other words, politics should be nurtured by present-day realities, Mikhail Gorbachev said. The Soviet Union has no intention whatsoever to encroach on ties between various regions of the world. We treat with understanding the interests that Western countries have in the East and in the South. But we disagree with the policy according to which these interests should be satisfied at the expense of the interests of those whose resources this concerns. Both encroachments on historically formed ties and refusal to take into account the lawful rights of the new states are equally fraught with explosive situations.

A difficult process is under way -- from understanding what policy is needed by the world today to formulating this policy as such, Mikhail Gorbachev said further. We are now exactly at this stage. And it is important therefore to meet each other half way. The USSR is prepared to cooperate with the West in the search for the best balance of interests.

In this context the interlocutors spoke highly of the recent forum in Moscow "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity". They agreed that the entire significance of what had happened was yet to be realised -- what sort of an event this was and what follows from it.

Giulio Andreotti said that in his entire activities he proceeded from the conviction that the world should become wiser. That is one of the reasons why he welcomes what is now happening in the Soviet Union and which, he said, "is very important for all of us".

Much attention during the conversation was given to the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Both agreed that there are influential forces in the United States which want resultative talks, the attainment of accords.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union approaches with all seriousness the development of relations with the United States. The Soviet Union is for developing contacts, for continuing disarmament talks, not formal talks but substantive ones. It does not see, however, an adequate reply reaction, Gorbachev went on. The United States leadership is retreating from Reykjavik and has already reached a line when the ABM Treaty, which is of fundamental importance, is being put in question. The "broader interpretation" of the treaty is not a routine, transient element at the talks, it is a matter of principle.

In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev said that the main thing at present is to prevent the wrecking of the ABM Treaty. Otherwise the talks will be depreciated, the arms race will escape control, instability will become critical, distrust and suspicion will grow. That would be a blow to the East-West political dialogue which is only beginning to pick up pace and would have grave psychological consequences for the entire world public. A shadow will be cast over everything. To put it briefly, this would be a great political mistake.

On its part, Mikhail Gorbachev said, the Soviet Union will do everything to prevent such a turn of events. But there must be understanding of the importance of this issue by everybody. Giulio Andreotti assured his interlocutor that intentions to abandon the ABM Treaty are not shared either in Italy or in other West European countries.

Problems of eliminating and reducing nuclear arms of various classes in Europe, as well as of conventional arms and armed forces were studied. Giulio Andreotti remarked that the terms proportion and disproportion should be sorted out. Mikhail Gorbachev showed understanding of Giulio Andreotti's considerations.

The main problem and the main obstacles on the road to disarmament are of a political nature, Mikhail Gorbachev said in this connection. This is a question of political will, a question of intent.

Principled moments [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1624 GMT on 27 February in an identical report renders "principled moments" as "fundamental points"] of a Middle East settlement were discussed in connection with the declaration by the EEC countries stating a favourable attitude to the Soviet proposal to work for an international conference on the Middle East. The two agreed that what is being meant, to use Giulio Andreotti's words, is "preparation to prepare" a conference with most thorough account for the interests of all the interested sides and without attendant preliminary conditions.

In conclusion Mikhail Gorbachev said that Soviet foreign policy reflects among other things feelings of great respect and friendship for the Italian people. This too is a reality of the present European and international situation, he said. It is in this spirit that the visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to Italy this year will be prepared.

Eduard Shevardnadze, the Italian ambassador in the USSR Sergio Ramano and the secretary general of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs Renato Rugiero were present at the conversation.

Andreotti Luncheon Speech

LD272229 Moscow TASS in English 2127 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Excerpts] Moscow February 27 TASS--"Italian-Soviet ties have become a substantial factor in international relations as an example of cooperation and mutual respect between countries belonging to different alliances and political systems", said Giulio Andreotti, Italy's foreign minister. He spoke today at a luncheon given in his honour by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

"Indeed, nothing is more important than safeguarding peace. Italy gives priority to precisely this task. We are convinced that in moral and political aspects there must be no alternative to safeguarding peace.

"Quests for a military balance of a new type are of much importance in the process of consolidating international accord. The Reykjavik meeting, even if it has not led to actual arrangements, has been an important movement of this process. In the Icelandic capital we saw for the first time how prospects for a sharp alteration of the tendency of the past 40 years emerge through a substantial reduction of nuclear arms. But it is not enough to freeze arms. It is necessary to start resolutely the elimination of arsenals which are built up in horrible proportions during the arms race.

"European countries, among them Italy, do not want the Reykjavik results to be wasted. They wish that the striving for solving global tasks should not interfere with the conclusion of agreements even on specific matters, when there exists every condition for this. We declare for the observance of the existing treaties, against advancing preliminary conditions which would block the talks and, in the long run, would throw back both countries to the initial positions. There is a need to conclude agreements which would mean a turn so long awaited in the East and the West.

"We would like to see in Vienna the signs of progress in the spheres in which the Europeans have always been showing special interest, from reductions of conventional armaments to economic cooperation and human rights".

Shevardnadze Addresses Luncheon

LD272111 Moscow TASS in English 2102 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Excerpts] Moscow February 27 TASS--"Your visit to Moscow and our meeting bear evidence to the mutual aspiration of our countries for such a Europe which, as in the epoch of quattrocento, would emanate an energy of cultural humanism", the USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said in his speech at a luncheon held in honour of the Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti.

"Today we become increasingly convinced of the need of joint work for a nuclear-free world, for creating a system of all-embracing security, for eliminating seats of war danger in various parts of the globe and settling regional conflicts, be it in the Middle East or in Central America".

"The Soviet leadership's alarms and fears that the revived contemporary movement in Europe for security and cooperation is being slowed down by scholastic constructions of the mythical Atlantic solidarity should be understandable to you, a plenipotentiary representative of the country of the Renaissance", Shevardnadze went on. "And beyond the continent we see a multitude of instances of attempts to distort agreements and lift restrictions on the arms race with truly medieval chicanery, attempts to adjust jurisprudence to justify armed encroachments on mankind's peaceful outer space, to subordinate science to these dangerous aims. The present-day alchemists and obscurantists must be rebuffed. And it is formed by a multitude of efforts, including purely scientific ones".

Rome Radio Interviews Andreotti

LD272041 Rome Domestic Service in Italian 1830 GMT 27 Feb 87

[Excerpt] Two hours well spent. This is what Andreotti said at the end of a lengthy talk held today in the Kremlin with the Soviet leader, Gorbachev. Here is a report by Renato Caporilli, our special correspondent:

[Begin recording] [Caporilli] Italian-Soviet relations have become an important point of reference on the international scene, particularly when it comes to strengthening East-West dialogue and detente. This is the impression that one gets following Andreotti's visit to Moscow. This was personally said by Gorbachev to the Italian foreign minister during a talk that lasted over 2 hours; 2 hours well spent, Andreotti said. This talk was the climax of the visit, along with the signing of the agreement for the Soviets to join Professor Zichichi's World Laboratory.

Gorbachev's visit to Italy was also confirmed. It is under study and will definitely take place this year. Andreotti's talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze mainly centered on the contribution which countries belonging to different alliances can make in order to consolidate international entente. This is what Andreotti said to us in an interview:

[Andreotti] I think that Italy is making a contribution to two fronts -- one took place today, here at the Academy of Sciences, a crowning achievement following many months of trying to bring together not only Italian and Soviet scientists, but scientists from all over the world, including the United States. This is a contribution that we are making to detente.

[Caporilli interrupting] On disarmament, is it possible to reach intermediary stages before reaching a global agreement?

[Andreotti] The main thing is to have a framework that provides encouragement to believe in these intermediary stages. No one would be in a position to achieve an immense whole. It is essential that there should be a connection, particularly mutual trust.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1350

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTAGE ON OFFICIAL VISIT OF ITALY'S FANFANI

Received by Gromyko

LD232036 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 23 Feb 87

[Excerpt] Moscow February 23 TASS--Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin today Amintore Fanfani, prominent Italian politician and chairman of the Senate of the Italian Republic.

At the beginning of the conversation Fanfani said that the present visit was the first official trip to the Soviet Union of a chairman of the Italian Senate in the history of Soviet-Italian relations. Touching upon problems of war and peace, he said that from the point of view of Italians a war did not promote anything and one could not build anything with the help of it. Today's circumstances are such that the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the U.S., should become the guarantors of peace in international relations.

Andrey Gromyko said that the Soviet Union would also like it to be this way. However, a number of governments are following a different path: They are increasing military allocations, developing new types of weapons, stockpiling nuclear weapons and seeking to implement the program of militarization of space. Their offices and laboratories are working on the sly, not in sight of the peoples, and these activities are being carried on to a considerable extent behind the veil of secrecy.

Speaking about the Soviet concept of the world, he emphasized that today it was important to all participants in international dealings to agree on the main point: to do their utmost for warding off the menace of a nuclear war. Humanity is capable of doing it.

The already created capacity to destroy the earth and all the living beings is madness. Our country and people come out for putting an end to this madness. Nature has created man and humanity not for them to destroy themselves.

Security should be created not through the building up of stockpiles of weapons, but through trust, cooperation and the solution of security problems on the basis of reciprocity. Some politicians are lacking the awareness of the danger that has emerged for peace, for all the people in the world, and the resolve to eliminate it. The U.N. Charter exists not for being used as a cover-up for the interference of some countries in the internal affairs of others, for the policy of international terrorism, for the striving for establishing military domination over the world.

The Soviet Union which is aware of its immense responsibility and is proud of its policy of peace and humanism will continue to use its authority and influence for promoting peace and friendship. This fully refers to the countries of Europe which is home both for Italy and the USSR.

Our foreign policy activities and doctrines reflect the aspirations and plans of the Soviet people in the sphere of the internal development of the state. Peace and peace alone -- this is the guideline of the USSR foreign policy which is expressed in concrete proposals set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Geneva, Reykjavik and quite recently in Moscow at the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, For the Survival of Humanity".

Meets With Gorbachev

LD241915 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1805 GMT 24 Feb 87

[Text] Moscow, 24 Feb (TASS) -- Mikhail Gorbachev today met in the Kremlin with Amintore Fanfani, chairman of the Italian Republic's senate. The partners in the conversation touched on the most important issues of our times. They discussed politicians' high level of responsibility for the destinies of their countries, of Europe, and the world; about the place of Italy and the USSR in the contemporary world process; the role of science in forming policy; the importance of mutual understanding between ideologically different forces; and of a serious and respectful attitude toward every people's choice of its own historical path.

There was mention of how important links between a country's leadership and its people are, especially at the present stage, and of the importance of both correcting policy in accordance with public perception and the way it influences them, and also guaranteeing feedback of ideas, opinions, and advice coming from the people.

For the development of a modern state it is very important to seek out, highlight, and define the proper place for talent, not only in production, science, technology and culture, but also in the sphere of politics itself and of public activity.

M.S. Gorbachev briefed A. Fanfani on current Soviet domestic and foreign policy, and that some approaches to solving problems facing the country had already been found, while others still must be researched and formulated.

The policy of restructuring has been drafted by the whole of the objective course of the country's development and by the whole of the complex and difficult history of our state. Its necessity arose a long time ago, but there was delay in observing this, and figuratively speaking, the child's old clothes began to come apart on the adolescent. Society has matured; through suffering it has won the changes that are now being implemented. The road ahead of us is a long one. We shall tread firmly and consistently, but also carefully, so as not to upset the boat, and so that neither the crew nor the passengers get seasick. In this we shall be strictly guided by socialist principles and criteria.

A. Fanfani spoke about the intense interest in Italy and among all strata of Italian society in what is now happening in the Soviet Union, and that every Italian possessing political awareness wishes the Soviet leadership success in the new transformations. Success in these changes in the Soviet Union has huge importance for the whole world, but its failure would be a tragedy for mankind.

M.S. Gorbachev described the international situation as unsatisfactory. The arms race is continuing, and the risk of war is growing. The alternative is in the humanizing of international relations. What is necessary for this is new thinking proceeding from an understanding of general mutual dependence and rooted on the idea of civilization's survival.

If in politics they can realize this and put it into practice, then it will be a victory for reason. For our part, we are not only proclaiming a new outlook on the world but also strive to do something concrete, not just to please anyone but because this is necessary to resolve both our domestic problems and common, international ones to which we have a total responsible attitude.

The partners in conversation discovered much in common in their understanding of what mankind now needs, having achieved a high level of scientific-technical progress that is burdened by acute problems both on a national and international level.

M.S. Gorbachev discussed the profound respect for the Italian people and about his desire to have another meeting with Italy; he spoke highly of the political dialogue between the USSR and Italy, expressed satisfaction at their economic relations, and a readiness to develop these in accordance with the times in the interests of Italy and the USSR, and for the good of Europe and of the cause of peace.

Meets Tolkunov, Zagladin

PMO31119 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 87 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talk at USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] On 24 February, a meeting took place at the USSR Supreme Soviet between A. Fanfani, chairman of the Italian Senate, Senate commission chairmen G. Benedetti, L.G. Giugni, and M.F. Aggradi and L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Supreme Soviet deputies V.V. Zagladin, I.D. Laptev, N.I. Maslennikov, and M.P. Trunov.

During the meeting, which passed in an atmosphere of warmth and mutual interest in a better knowledge of the situation and processes developing in both countries, there was a detailed exchange of opinions on questions of the activity of the parliaments of the USSR and Italy, in particular in the legislative sphere and on questions of their liaison and relationships with the mass media and the public.

Both sides voiced opinions on the present world situation. The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies provided information on the Soviet leadership's peace-loving initiatives. The guests' attention was drawn to M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity." The common opinion was voiced regarding the need to make headway on the path of nuclear disarmament and the reduction of conventional armaments, the political solution of regional conflicts, and the development of all-European cooperation. The growing role of parliaments and parliamentary exchanges in the development of these processes was noted.

A. Fanfani invited the chairman of the chamber of the USSR Supreme Soviet to pay a return visit to Italy. The invitation was accepted with satisfaction.

On the same day, a luncheon was held on behalf of the chairman of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the occasion of the visit of the chairman of the Italian Senate.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1350

RELATED ISSUES

GROMYKO RECEIVES SWEDISH PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

PMO21259 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 87 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Reception in the Kremlin"]

[Excerpts] "We have proceeded and still proceed from the fact that for mankind there is no more important problem than nuclear disarmament and the struggle to preserve life on earth."

That is how Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium began his answer to the first question asked by Ingemund Bengtsson, speaker of the Swedish Riksdag. The point of this question was to describe the international situation and Soviet-U.S. relations at the moment, now that some time has passed since the summit meeting in Reykjavik between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the U.S. President.

This dialogue took place on 27 February in the Kremlin during a conversation between A.A. Gromyko and a delegation from the Swedish Riksdag, which is currently in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Describing the present international situation, A.A. Gromyko said: "Reykjavik showed that an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on reducing nuclear arms is possible. The peoples felt, if I can use such an expression, the breath [dykhaniye] of that agreement. The negotiations came up against a wall erected by the U.S. Administration, which has no wish to renounce its "Star Wars" program, or, in other words, the militarization of outer space.

"As for the Soviet Union, it is willing to destroy nuclear weapons, and willing to move toward this objective stage by stage while observing the need for equal security of the two sides. The Soviet Union is not striving for unilateral advantage."

I. Bengtsson: We in Sweden welcomed the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions and had an understanding attitude toward the resumption of nuclear tests in the USSR.

A.A. Gromyko: We could act no other way. Making the moratorium permanent would have meant giving the United States the opportunity of obtaining a unilateral advantage.

I. Bengtsson: Do you consider that a more active approach on the international level in the sphere of utilizing nuclear power for peaceful purposes is important?

A.A. Gromyko, in answer to this question, spoke in detail of the USSR's efforts to extent international cooperation in the area of the peaceful use of atomic power, including within the framework of the IAEA. We advocate, he said, the use of the IAEA in all its power for these purposes.

I. Bengtsson: We know that between NATO and the Warsaw Pact there have been some points of contact. We would like to have more detailed information about this.

A.A. Gromyko: Yes, the Warsaw Pact member-states have submitted a proposal to the NATO states to eliminate the two military groups that confront each other in Europe. But in diplomacy it is well-known that when someone wants to put an issue on ice, they say that it has to be carefully thought out, considered, studied, and so on. It is precisely in this way that the governments of the NATO countries respond to our proposal. They have already been "studying" it for many years.

The conversation passed in a businesslike atmosphere of goodwill.

Present from the Soviet side were alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium First Vice President Petr Demichev, Chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, Secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Tengez Menteshashvili, and USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy M.S. Lichuzhkin; from the Swedish side -- Seond Deputy Chairman of the Riksdag Karl Erik Eriksson, deputies of the Riksdag, officials accompanying the Swedish parliamentary delegation, and the Swedish Ambassador in the USSR Anders Thunborg.

Also today a meeting with the Swedish members of parliament was held at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Questions of bilateral relations as well as some international problems were discussed. The sides exchanged information on the structure and main directions of activity of the parliaments of the two countries.

A luncheon in honor of the delegation was held in the name of the chairmen of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1350

RELATED ISSUES

BOMBAY ANALYST SAYS CHALLENGE REMAINS AFTER MOSCOW MEET

Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English 21 Feb 87 p 8

[Article by K. Subrahmanyam]

[Text]

A NUMBER of Soviet organisations with the help of broad based International consultative steering committees organised a forum "for nuclear free world for survival of mankind" in Moscow on February 14-15. More than 900 foreign participants from well over 60 countries participated in the forum.

The deliberations were conducted in eight working groups for different disciplines. These were (I) doctors (II) political scientists (III) religious personnel (IV) scientists (V) businessmen (VI) writers and artists (VII) ex-military personnel and (VIII) environmentalists. The invitees included eminent political figures like Pierre Trudeau from Canada and Egon Bahr from the German Federal Republic, several Nobel laureates, eminent literary figures and artists such as Graham Greene, Norman Mailer, Gore Vidal, Gregory Peck, Maya Plisetskaya and Peter Ustinov, religious figures representing six religions, academics, arms controllers, strategists, retired and senior military officers. The man who attracted most attention in the conference was Dr. Andrei Sakharov, the dissident Soviet physicist who took full part in the deliberations and forcefully maintained his stand on human rights.

Soviet Hosts

The two-day discussions were wide ranging without a structured agenda. The Soviet hosts explained that this was done in order to have uninhibited, freest possible, critical discussion. They were as good as their word and listened to most severe criticisms of Soviet policies and replied to them in detail in deadpan tones. There was also a certain

amount of self-criticism. And as Prof. Galbraith remarked, the remarkable thing was in two days of discussions the terms "capitalism," "socialism" and "communism" were not mentioned at all.

Among the political scientists' forum, in which I participated, there was a deep division between those who believed that nuclear weapons could be eliminated as was the scourge of small-pox and those who maintained that nuclear weapons cannot be disinvented and can never be eliminated. While the Soviets, the socialist bloc participants, the Indians, the doctors, the writers and artists, the religious leaders and the environmentalists belonged to the first category. Most of the western academics, arms controllers, majority of western military men and scientists formed the second. The two days of discussion could not bridge this divide. Indeed, the one perceptible gain of this forum is to highlight this issue as the foremost contradiction facing mankind today. On the satisfactory resolution of this depends the future survival of the human race.

The nuclear cultists argued that nuclear deterrence had contributed to the preservation of peace in the industrialised world in the last four decades. They contrasted this peace with innumerable inter-state and intra-state wars in the developing world where nuclear deterrence did not operate. They were convinced that it would not be possible to have an alternative international system with adequate and reliable verification to eliminate all suspicion that a country might have kept back or concealed a few nuclear weapons, or one where conventional superiority in armed forces would not destabilise

the present strategic stability in the absence of nuclear deterrence. Underlying these arguments was the perception that the present nuclear-weapons-dominated international system was tolerable and to their advantage and those who argue in favour of changing the *status quo* towards a non-nuclear one had the burden of proving that the alternative would result in a world of stability in which the advantages the western industrialised nations enjoy would not be adversely affected.

Chemical Plants

Those opposed to the nuclear theology pointed out that the proposition that nuclear deterrence alone or to a significant extent preserved peace in the industrialised world was unprovable. It was equally plausible to argue that war had become a nonviable instrument of policy in the industrialised world because of the density of industrialisation, the existence of a large number of atomic power and chemical plants and the rise in political consciousness of the populations. Even a conventional war in Europe would result in dozens of Chernobyls and hundreds of Bhopals and it was no longer feasible to keep large populations under alien occupation. Even a conventional war in Europe would be an ecological catastrophe of unforeseen magnitude. If nuclear weapons could not be disinvited, then it was also inevitable they would spread to new nations and might also come into the possession of terrorists. The argument that nuclear weapons could not be disinvited and that mankind was condemned to live with them for ever was historically untenable. The same kind of arguments were advanced in the past in respect of slavery, colonialism, monarchy, and diseases like small-pox and polio.

However those who argued against the nuclear cult agreed that adequate work has not been done on the concept of a nuclear weapons-free world, on how it could contribute to greater stability and to a

more cooperative approach to international relations.

It is against this background that Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev delivered his plenary address to the international forum on February 16, 1987. This provoked divergent responses. While Prof. Galbraith said that as an ex-speech writer he regarded it as one of the best crafted speeches, many western academics and arms controllers felt it had nothing new to say.

Gorbachev joined issue on the great debate without pulling any punches. He declared "we reject any right for leaders of a country, be it the USSR, the US or any other, to pass a death sentence on mankind. We are not judges and the billions of people are not criminals to be punished. So the nuclear guillotine must be broken. The nuclear powers must overstep their nuclear shadow and enter a nuclear-free world, thus ending the alienation of politics from the general human norms of ethics." He came out clearly against the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, against putting weapons in space and against military bases in foreign countries and pleaded that humanity must get stronger and overcome the nuclear sickness and thus enter the post-nuclear age.

Beyond reiterating the Soviet proposals for disarmament put forward on January 15, 1986, at the 27th party congress, at the Budapest meet of Warsaw pact powers and at Reykjavik the Soviet leader did not make any new proposals at this international forum. Though some western participants had entertained such expectations and Dr. Bernard Lown pleaded on behalf of the doctors for an extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests, no new concessions were made in his speech.

The speech however contained two ideas which are new and one disclosure about the present stage in Geneva arms control negotiations. The two ideas were: (a) that the intrusion of weapons in space constituted a threat of blackmail against independent states and hence the

need for an international law to prohibit such deployment and (b) that the Soviet Union might in future demand extension of verification procedures to U.S. bases in foreign countries and ask for inspection access to them. Mr. Gorbachev also reported that the U.S. had already officially suggested legitimisation of the broader interpretation of the ABM treaty in Geneva which, according to him, would result in blunting the treaty and opening new dimensions in the nuclear missile race. Mr. Gorbachev asserted that this move was a clear violation of the pledge adopted by him and President Reagan at Geneva in November 1985 "to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability."

Soviet Initiative

The majority of the western political scientists and arms controllers attending the conference were not converted to the philosophy of a nuclear weapons-free world. While many of them admitted that Mr. Gorbachev had seized the initiative and had made a favourable impact on sections of the population in the west still, the tendency was to shrug off the concept of a world free of nuclear weapons as propaganda.

The forum was a good step in making the world sensitive to the goal of a nuclear weapons-free future. But a detailed study on how we get there, how stable a nuclear weapons-free world would be, what alternative security structures and processes would be needed, whether a nuclear weapons-free world would be realistic unless it was embedded in a cooperative international community with significantly reduced conventional arms—a stage closer to the idea of general and complete disarmament—has to be presented by those who believe that nuclear weapons can be eliminated. This is the challenge which the Soviet and nonaligned movement have to meet.

/9274

CSO: 5250/0011

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

PIRZADA TO DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE--Yesterday Sharif-al-Din Pirzada, secretary general of the Islamic Conference Organization, left Jeddah for Moscow to attend the international seminar on nuclear disarmament for securing international peace and security which will meet next Friday and Saturday. Participating in it will be a number of scholars and experts from around the world. The Qatar News Agency noted that Sharif-al-Din Pirzada will take advantage of the opportunity of his visit to Moscow to hold a number of meetings with senior Soviet officials to discuss the possibility of Moscow undertaking a role in lessening international tensions and especially in a major manner in the Middle East situation and the Iran-Iraq war. It is noteworthy that this is Pirzada's second visit to Moscow this year. [Text] [Ta'izz AL-JUMHURIYAH in Arabic 11 Feb 87 p 2] 12502

MUFTI ATTENDS DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE--Yesterday the Mufti of the Republic, Ahmad Zabarah, departed for Moscow to attend the international nuclear disarmament conference to guarantee international peace and security which is being held at the invitation of Soviet Muslims and Christians in Moscow. The mufti said in a statement to the SABA News Agency that the conference, which begins next Friday, will be attended by scholars of various religions and nuclear scientists who will study the danger of nuclear war, the continuation of nuclear testing and the Star Wars program. [Text] [Sanaa AL-THAWRAH in Arabic 13 Feb 87 p 2] 12502

MUFTI KHALID ATTENDS MOSCOW CONFERENCE.--His Eminence Shaykh Hasan Khalid, the mufti of the Republic of Lebanon, returned to Beirut from Moscow via Larnaca at 1400 today. Mufti Khalid spent about 2 weeks in the Soviet Union, where he attended the peace conference for a nonnuclear world. Upon his return, his eminence went straight to his house in 'Aramun without making any statements. Mufti Khalid will chair an extraordinary meeting of the Islamic Grouping in Dar al-Fatwa on Saturday. [Text] [Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 26 Feb 87 NC] /9274

CSO: 5200/4502

- END -

**END OF
FICHE**

DATE FILMED

29, April 1987